

METHODIST REVIEW

MARCH. 1927

THE RESURRECTION APPEARANCES

RICHARD JOSEPH COOKE

Athens, Tenn.

SOMEWHERE in the Memoirs of Barras, a member of the Directorate, 1789, the story is related that an enthusiast for the new order of things complained to Talleyrand—or was it to Barras himself?—of his ill success in founding a new religion; whereupon that astute diplomat suggested that he get himself crucified, be buried, and rise again the third day. History does not record the experiment.

The advice, however, should not be lost. In these days, when criticism of the gospel narratives of the Resurrection of our Lord and his appearance is so meticulous, it certainly should not be ignored by those who attempt to substitute a non-miraculous Christianity for the miracle of that Gospel which confronted its own age with the miracle of the ages—Jesus and the Resurrection. Perhaps it is safer to criticise than it is to be crucified.

The resurrection of our Lord from the dead is the most momentous fact in human history. It is the core of the Gospel, the bed rock upon which rest the doctrines, the entire system of Christian belief, the unshakable foundation of belief in immortality. Without it there may be imagination, but no certainty; hope, but no assurance that if a man dies he shall live again. For, "If Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Ye are yet in your sins." Reason as we may, indulge in poetry, trust the larger hope, discourse profoundly on the nature of man, on scientific conclusions derived from Evolution, on analogies from Nature, appeal to moral law, to the justice of

God, assume, to begin with, the thing to be proved, that man has a soul apart from his nervous system, inject into our premises what we intend to draw out in our conclusion—and yet when our collection of so-called proofs, or evidences, are all in, we shall be no more certain, not one whit further advanced in our reasoning than was Plato in the *Phædo*, or the cacklers disputing with Paul on Mars Hill. Jesus Christ alone “hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel.” Apart from him there is no certain, assuring evidence, despite all that may be alleged by the Society for Psychical Research and all our philosophizing since Adam that death is not the end of all. A short while before his death Bishop Quayle, who lived next door to Genius, wrote me:

“Love and the bluebird call to your heart. Spring is coming. Your words regarding *Out of Doors With Jesus* warm my heart increasingly. I love you, and have loved you long. Have you chanced to read recently ‘The Two Voices’? It is nearly as sweet as ‘Crossing the Bar.’ It was in the last volume that came from Tennyson’s pen—‘Death of Ænone’ and ‘Akbar’s Dream,’ etc. I love those volumes as they came from him through the years.”

Yes, Spring is coming, but when will it “visit the mouldering urn, when will it dawn on the night of the grave”? “We trust,” as Tennyson sings, “that somehow good will be the final goal of ill,” but Christ Jesus aside, how do we know?—we “poor orphans of nothing, alone on that lonely shore, born of the brainless Nature who knew not that which she bore.”

If the Resurrection is denied, a non-miraculous religion will fare no better than Talleyrand’s visitor’s dream, or Comte’s *Religion of Humanity*, which Huxley in his controversy with Frederic Harrison, Comte’s apostle in England, sneered out of court by saying he would just as soon worship a cage of monkeys. Nothing that originates in the human can ever lift humanity above the plane of the human, for “that which is born of flesh is flesh.” It is not the natural, of which we have more than enough, that we need, but the supernatural, for which there is no substitute. After all, it is Jesus or nothing. For, “if after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus what advantage it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.”

During the last fifty years, the critical attacks of the Tuebingen School upon the historicity of the Gospel records having proven futile, certain liberal writers now attempt to substitute a non-miraculous Christianity for the facts of the Gospel, and thereby in the interest, it is said, of reconciling religion and science, which is not needed, divert attention from the bodily resurrection of Jesus to a belief in his spiritual existence after death, which, it is asserted, was really his resurrection. But, as I have said elsewhere, an Easter faith without an Easter fact is Easter moonshine. The Resurrection as recorded in the Gospels is denied on the ground that being a miracle no evidence can prove it against the fixed laws of the universe. In order to avoid this supposed difficulty, another class, the mythologists, not willing to break with Christianity, accept the belief of the Early Church, but attribute the *form* of that belief to the influence of Oriental myth. (See T. K. Cheyne, *Bible Problems*.) Also at this present time there is a growing tendency in other circles to ignore the actual bodily resurrection of Jesus as not being a necessary element of the Christian faith, emphasis being placed instead upon belief in a present, living Christ, as if we knew of any Christ, living or dead, other than the Christ of the Gospels.

The Church of Christ is the mother of saints, but she appears also to be the nurse of heretics, for what eminent skeptic is there that was not nourished at her breast, or what perversion of the Gospel ever arose that did not originate under her roof? This attempted substitute is all of a piece with the notion that we need not accept as historical the narratives of Matthew and Luke relating to the Virgin Birth, a very intellectual notion but one that would leave us in sublime ignorance of the origin of the Christ. For, reject the historical character of those narratives, then what happens? We know the parents, the time of birth, of all the great characters of history, the parents and birthplace of all the great founders of the world's religions, but deleting those narratives as unhistorical, where did Jesus come from? Who were his parents? Where was he born? When? He steps into history, like Minerva from the head of Jove, full grown, and "lifts empires off their hinges," but where did he come from?

The limitations of space prevent more than the barest outline of what might be said in review of the theory that Jesus did not actually rise from the dead in the same, though not identical, body—it being changed into a spiritual body—that was crucified and was buried; and that Paul's conception of the Resurrection was wholly different from that of the Gospels and the Apostolic Church.

Now, that Jesus appeared bodily to his disciples after his resurrection is the record of the four Gospels. Whether that record be true or not, that he did so appear is as historically certain and as well attested as that he arose at all. The earliest record of the Resurrection and of these Appearances is that given by the apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Church at Corinth, probably about 56 A. D., although he had preached the same many years before.

"For I delivered unto you, first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures; and that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greatest part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. After that he was seen of James; then of all the apostles. And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time."

In this list, it will be observed, the apostle omits several Appearances recorded in the Gospels. No reference is made of the Appearance to the women, Matt. 28. 9; to Mary Magdalene, Mark 16. 9; John 20. 14; to the disciples on the way to Emmaus, Luke 24. 13; 25. 36; to the seven, John 21; nor to the other manifestations alluded to in the Acts. From these omissions it is assumed (Professor Schmiedel of Zurich in *Ency. Biblica*) that Paul had no knowledge of these Appearances. Evidently it is necessary to assume this by those who deny the corporeal resurrection of Jesus in order to discredit the historical character of the Gospel accounts of the objective Appearances which they give, and to admit those only which, it is alleged, are more of a visionary, or subjective character. But since the apostle does mention the Appearance to Peter which the Gospels do not mention, the question arises, How could Peter have known of that Appearance and not have known of the Appearance to Mary Magdalene and others who

reported the empty tomb to Peter? From whom did Paul obtain his information if not from Peter himself? Is it likely that Peter, informing Paul of the events connected with the Resurrection, failed to relate every Appearance of the Risen Lord? Is it likely that a little company of twelve or thirteen men and women united in a common bond, all participating in the most extraordinary experiences that ever fell to the lot of man, did not all know what each one knew? It is alleged, of course, that the disciples were scattered, had fled, as Schmiedel asserts, to Galilee in order to avoid arrest after the Crucifixion, and could not have known of the Resurrection and Appearances. This would be important, if true. But the facts are otherwise. The Gospels give abundant evidence that the disciples had not all gone to Galilee, but were within easy reach of each other in the city. Mary Magdalene knew exactly where Peter and John were and quickly brought them to the empty tomb. Moreover the disciples had a central meeting place, probably the home of John Mark's mother, Acts 12. 12, which could accommodate a large number. Peter knew where to find it the night of his escape from prison. The Jews knew of it also, for which reason the doors were kept closed for fear of a mob. Furthermore, much of what had occurred during Passion Week, and for some three days after, had become so well known or rumored in the city that the disciples on the Emmaus road were astonished that the Unknown who had joined himself to them did not know what everybody else knew. "Art thou a stranger in Jerusalem and hast not known the things which are come to pass in these days?"

It is incredible, on the face of it, that Paul, who was well acquainted with the leaders of the church long before he wrote this Epistle, and was also acquainted with some of the five hundred who had seen the Risen Lord, since he knows who of that number had recently died, did not know all the facts that were common knowledge in the Jerusalem Church. He had, previous to writing this Epistle, visited Peter and had remained with him fifteen days. Did he during this time learn nothing of the Resurrection events, nothing from any of the eye witnesses of those events still living in Jerusalem? What did he go for? He himself tells us that it

was to interrogate Peter as to facts, to compare his Gospel with the Gospel preached by the other apostles, the same Gospel he refers to in the first verse of 1 Cor. 15, which he had preached to the Corinthians four years before, and the same Gospel for which in writing to the Galatians he emphatically declared there could be no substitute.

But in direct opposition to the testimony of the apostle above given is the assertion by propagandists of a non-miraculous Christianity that Paul had no such conception of the Resurrection and the Appearances as the Gospels record.

"If we ask, then, just how Paul conceived Jesus' resurrection, we have already the answer to that question. Jesus in death laid aside the *σῶμα σαρκικόν* and after an interval of hours, during which he (or his 'self,' *σῶμα* in the strict sense) existed 'naked,' in the lower world among *οἱ νεκροί* he was raised *ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν* into the heavenlies and endowed with his new *σῶμα πνευματικόν*. His followers' fellowship with him henceforth is with a living man, not with the memory of a dead leader. Negatively it is absolutely clear that Paul not only did not hold the view that Jesus' resurrection concerned his buried body and necessitated an empty grave, but that he protests strongly against any supposition that might lead to such a view. That view is precisely the thing which his whole discussion is concerned to combat. That this has not been clear to every student is simply another tribute to the influence of the precedence of the Gospel stories in order and in emphasis." "Paul's thought never succeeded in becoming the common possession of the Early Church. If it had, we should not have had the Gospel stories in their present form." "When Paul is read with the Gospel stories entirely ignored it becomes absolutely certain that in his thought there was no empty grave, no revived body and that 1 Cor. 15 is the most forcible argument ever brought against the narrative of the Gospels." (*The Resurrection in the New Testament*, Clayton R. Bowen, Professor of New Testament Interpretation in Meadville Theological School, pp. 106, 40ff.)

To all this it must be said that Paul never had even the faintest shadow of the ideas above attributed to him. If such was his belief, it is evident on the face of it that there would have been no need for him to refer to the *burial* of Jesus, which emphasized the certainty of Christ's bodily resurrection. That which he says was buried is that which was raised. Paul certainly did not preach, nor anywhere teach, that Christ rose from the dead on the Cross; that his Resurrection began at the moment of death when he entered the spirit world, and not on the "third day" from the

tomb in the Garden. It would seem very much like the bankruptcy of common sense to attribute such belief to the apostle who not only asserts Christ rose the third day but also builds his argument for the resurrection of the body on the very fact that Christ's body arose.

The error of the aphones in Corinth who had supposed resurrection meant revivification of the material body unchanged, was, on the contrary, so thoroughly uprooted by Paul's teaching, based upon the spiritual nature of the Lord's risen body—and which, we may say in passing, is no longer to be denied or ignored but is supported by the latest scientific researches into the ultimate constitution of matter—that that error never became the belief of the church, although some Fathers of the Ante-Nicene period indulged in fantastic notions, as did Irenæus on the millennium. Neither Paul nor the Gospels know anything of a mere revivification and resuscitation of the Lord's body, nor that he left his body in the tomb and assumed a purely spiritual, absolutely non-material, inconceivable body. Paul is at one with the Gospels, which came later, and, be it remembered, when so much is made by negative critics of discrepancies in the Resurrection Narratives, errors, interpolations, manipulations of sources, and all of which we may readily admit, that *there is nothing in the Gospels which was not first in the church*. Each writer selected from the common knowledge of those who were eye witnesses, what he designed for his Gospel, but no Gospel supports the idea that the Risen Body of the Lord was the former body revived. Revivification is not Resurrection. That the body of the Lord did manifest similar superiority to physical law before his Resurrection as after is clear enough, but those miraculous powers did not belong to him as man. They became natural, inseparable from him only after his Resurrection as the conqueror of death, the "Prince of life" who is alive forever more. Who can seriously believe that Paul's preaching, whether oral or written, as in 1 Cor. 15, was merely to assert the survival of the soul after death? that the Jesus who was crucified, was dead, and was buried, was, nevertheless, still living? Was it necessary to state what no one disputed? To go all the way to Athens and argue about the immortality of the soul

to Greek philosophers? Probably Paul had never read the *Phædo*, or the *Gorgias*, but they had, and possibly Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* also. It was only when he came to "Jesus and the Resurrection" that trouble began. When Paul interrogated King Agrippa, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" he was not asking Agrippa whether he believed in the immortality of the soul, but whether he thought it impossible for God to restore to life a dead and buried Jesus.

Between Paul and the apostles there was no difference of belief as to the character of the Appearance. To assert such at this present is simply to revamp the old theory of Christian Ferdinand Bauer of conflicting parties in the Apostolic Church (*Church History of the First Three Centuries*), a theory no longer of any standing among scholars. Paul undoubtedly asserts, on the contrary, the unanimity of belief among the apostles when he declares to these Corinthians, *whether they or I so we preach and so ye believed*. "If Christ be not risen then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. Yea, and we are found false witnesses against God because we have testified that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up if so be that the dead rise not." The pronouns "we," "our," are not editorial, but refer to, and include, the whole body of the apostles who had been eye witnesses of the Resurrection-Appearances. At the date this Epistle was written all the apostles were still living. So extremely careful were these first preachers of the Gospel that there should be no variation, no substitution, no corruption of the truth they proclaimed, that any deviation from, and certainly any substitution for the facts as they knew them would be quickly repudiated, and Paul himself expelled from the company of the apostles, as he expelled Hymenæus and Philetus from the church. Paul knows only that very Gospel which they all preached. "I marvel," he writes to the Galatians, "that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel, which is not another. But there are some that trouble you, and would pervert the Gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you than that we have preached unto

you, let him be accursed." So intense is his feeling in this matter, that with added emphasis he repeats his repudiation of any change, "As we said before, so say I now again. If any man preach any other Gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Paul, of course, is not here dealing specifically with the Resurrection, but the passage is quoted simply to show the anxiety of the first preachers of the Gospel that there should be no variations, no perversion of the Gospel they preached.

In his sermon in the house of Cornelius, Acts 10. 39, Peter declares, "We are witnesses of all that he (Jesus) did both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem: whom they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised up the third day and showed him openly, not to all the people, but to witnesses chosen before of God, even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead." This is in line with Peter's sermon on the Day of Pentecost. Evidently, Peter had no notion that the Appearances of the risen Lord were not such as could be normally apprehended, that they were not objective but subjective, not corporeal but phantasmal. At Antioch, still showing the unity of the belief among the apostles, Paul used precisely the same argument from prophecy that Peter had used at Pentecost—"Thou shalt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. For David after he had served his own generation by the will of God fell asleep and was laid to his fathers and saw corruption: but he whom God raised up again saw no corruption." What was it that did not, could not, see corruption—spirit or body? If, certainly, body, then it was the body of Jesus that did not see corruption, and thus it is seen that this was the conviction of both Peter and Paul, and that they held the same belief with all the other apostles, that Jesus rose bodily from the grave. Neither Peter nor Paul, nor any in the Church at Jerusalem, preached a non-miraculous, invisible Resurrection of Jesus, but whether quoting prophecy or affirming their own testimony, they declared, and could not have been understood otherwise than to have declared, that Jesus rose bodily from the dead. This was the Gospel Paul preached among both Jews and Gentiles throughout the Græco-Roman world. This was the Gospel which then and since then, despite all opposition, political and other, the migra-

tions of nationalities, the rise of new languages, the barriers of ignorance, the spread of culture widening like the coming of the dawn, has changed the currents of the world's thought, the character of races and their civilizations, and produced through all the long stretch of time and in every land the highest and the holiest type of manhood and womanhood the world has ever known. It cannot be that this Gospel was founded upon a falsehood. It cannot be that this Gospel maintained itself through all these centuries among the most intellectual and dominant races of men upon a misunderstanding. If this were so there could be no essential difference, no worthy distinction, between truth and falsehood; no necessity for truth at all, for what more could truth do to change the shadow of death into the light of the morning that a lie has not already done? "The pillared firmament is rottenness and earth's base built on stubble!"

The testimony of the Empty Tomb is relevant here. What became of the body of the Lord? All conjectures of skepticism since the day he arose have been rejected one after another. Dr. Percy Gardner, a thoroughgoing exponent of negative criticism in England, in his book *Exploratio Evangelica*, p. 260, says, "What really became of the body of the crucified Jesus is a problem which history is utterly powerless to solve." "In my opinion the empty grave offers us a problem which objective history can never solve" (p. 258). A statement which, if there were no history in the Gospels which cannot be ignored, would probably be true, but in the face of the Gospel record is not an answer but an evasion, a refusal to recognize the testimony of men who staked their lives upon the reality of the facts they proclaimed. Certainly neither the act itself, nor the precise instant, nor the process of the Resurrection was discernible, nor could it have been, even if all Jerusalem had been present. The scientist in his laboratory, watching with intense interest the transmutation of substances in the tube before him, cannot tell the exact moment, the infinitesimal instant, when the transmutation occurs, for even while he is looking the invisible atoms have already been changed, and all he sees is the result of their invisible activity. Had Joseph of Arimathea remained in the tomb he could not have witnessed the transmuta-

tion of the Lord's material body into a spiritual body, analogous to which Paul says we shall all be changed in a moment (*απομῶ*), in the twinkling of an eye—the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption, since flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, this mortal must put on immortality; “. . . and be fashioned like unto his glorious body”—the body of his glory.

But the emptiness of the tomb is not all there is to be considered. The popular conception probably is that the friends of Jesus wrapped the linen they had purchased around the body of the Lord and thus enswathed laid it in the tomb. This is an error. The Jews followed the method of the Egyptians. The linen was not wrapped in one piece around the body, but was torn into strips—*ὀθονιοῦς* John 19. 40, diminutive from *οθονῆ*—and these, smeared with the spices and unguents, were wrapped around each limb. Now, the point is, that, when Peter entered the tomb he saw the linen clothes, *these strips*, lying, not in a heap or scattered about, but *lying, κελμενα, undisturbed*, just as they had been when wrapped around each limb, following the contour of the body. The idea seems to be that these strips of linen were not taken *from* the body, but that the body had *passed through* them, leaving them in their original position—the head piece, *συνδαριόν*, folded up in a place by itself, showing that it had been removed *after* the Resurrection had taken place. This folding suggests bodily action and unanswerably refutes the idea that the Resurrection of Jesus occurred in the spirit world. The declaration of the angels, if objective history will not exclude them, “He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay” (Matt. 28. 6); “He is risen: he is not here: behold the place where they laid him” (Mark 16. 6); “He is not here, but risen” (Luke 24. 6), and the statement in John 20. 12, leave not even the slightest room for doubt, if any evidence for the Resurrection is admissible, that the body of Jesus which was crucified, was dead, and was buried, was that very same body that was raised from the dead—the “same” but not the “identical,” for there is a wide difference between sameness and identity. It was buried a *φρικόν* body, it rose a *πνευματικόν* body.

Just here difference of opinion arises as to the nature of the Lord's resurrection body. The question is whether it arose a spiritualized body or whether its change from a material to a spiritual body was gradually progressive till it finally entered the Unseen Holy. From our foregoing interpretation of the word *κειμένα*, which will probably be disputed, but for which there is solid ground, the opinion of the writer may be correctly inferred. This interpretation, however, should not be accepted without critical consideration of all that may be alleged against it. Those opposing arguments which favor a progressive change are not easily disposed of in view of the apparently physical character of our Lord's Appearances and especially his offering himself to physical tests to prove that he was not spirit (John 20. 27). Nor, on the other hand, is it easy in asserting the spirituality of his risen body to avoid the docetic doctrine that our Lord's body was not a real body but one in appearance only. In affirming the spiritual nature of the Lord's risen body it is not supposed that the material, natural, body had become spirit. Matter cannot become spirit. If such were possible or had been the case, then our Lord had and each of all who are raised will have or consist of two spirits, himself and the one acquired by the change in the body.

By spiritual body is meant a body, or *σῶμα*, which is a perfect medium of the spirit in its contact with the material universe. Without conceivable limitation upon the thought or activity of the spirit it does or becomes what the spirit wills; becomes visible or invisible, assumes such form or appearance as the spirit desires; traverses space with the rapidity of thought; is superior to physical law and the constitution of matter; is not ponderable and is as real as spirit which is the ultimate of reality, there being nothing beyond it, and yet is not spirit, but the garment of spirit.

Such an hypothesis is of course open to objections on several lines. It certainly will be rejected by those whose range of thought never reaches beyond the material, and probably by those who, concentrating their attention solely on either the spiritual or the material, allow for no interaction, for no play of the forces of one upon the other. But if there is, as we know there is, transformation of energy in the realm of the physical, may there not be a correspond-

ing but vastly greater and higher transformation or transmutation of matter into something that is neither matter nor spirit but which retains certain qualities or capacities of matter and manifests the potentialities of spirit?

Such an hypothesis will not be summarily dismissed, however, by modern science. In the light of the revelations of science during the last fifty years it will become us to be a little modest in our affirmations of what is, or of what may not be, possible in a universe which is only just beginning to unfold its mysteries, its astounding secrets "which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest" through the prophets of a new era, the men of science who reveal to us beyond all visions of seers of old the mighty power of God and the wonders of his creation. Science is more religious than it used to be. The gospel of Mud is no longer preached. The days of Molleschott, of Buchner, of Vogt and other materialists are passed and will never return. An age which with its marvelous instruments, telescopes, microscopes, spectroscopes, micrometers, discovers, measures the distance, estimates the size and dissects the elementary constitution of stars in the remotest islands of light in the boundless heavens, and then turns to sound the depths of the infinitely small, to weigh atoms, to measure the speed of protons and electrons within the atom with all their mighty energies and to utilize the vibrations of that mysterious self-contradiction we call ether, out of which arise all that is visible in the heavens—an age that by radio sends its thoughts around the world a million times faster than sound traveling eleven hundred feet a second can carry it; that measures the distance between atoms so small that it would require two hundred and fifty thousand years to count the number in the head of a pin—an age that not only discovers but measures the size of a sub-microscopic super-germ that passes easily through the pores of a filter which will stop ordinary germs as if they were marbles; such an age, whose true prophets, awed by the heights and depths, by the wonders and splendors of the universe, cry out, "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty!" will no longer denounce the miracles of the New Testament as impossible; repudiate belief in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead as

contrary to Nature, and belittle itself by ignoring Him who is the greatest Miracle of all. For what is matter? What is ether, out of which all worlds rise and back into which all worlds vanish, like smoke rings in the air? Dr. Millikan, who obtained the Nobel Prize in 1913 for his researches in physical science, is authority for the statement that "The light that the human eye sees, the radio waves, the X-rays, the ultra violet and infra red rays are all ether waves radiated by electrons. And electrons are both matter and electricity and the stuff out of which the world is made."

But what has all this to do with the nature of the risen body of the Lord? It has this to do with it, that instead of the material body which was laid in the tomb being incapable of becoming spiritual, that instead of that body possessing the powers recorded of it in the Gospels, such as passing through closed doors, of eating, of changing its appearance, of vanishing and appearing—instead of these marvelous powers being in flat contradiction to the nature, to every attribute of matter, thus making miracles impossible, they are seen to be in perfect harmony with the laws of Nature, with the possibilities of matter acted upon by the Almighty Chemist, who does in his laboratory what the scientist does in his without violating the laws or the nature of the universe he has created. It is evident that whatever may be predicated of a material body being changed, transmuted into a spiritual body, a vehicle of the spirit—for it must have some medium which is not itself spirit in order to have contact with the world of matter—that also is a property of the molecules and atoms of which the material body is composed. No new matter is created. No new powers not possible to the essence of matter are created. The power of God works upon what already exists in matter, the transmutation from gross matter to something finer than ether being accomplished in the "twinkling of an eye." In trying to think through what may be involved in these latest discoveries of science, what light they may throw upon questions of Christian faith, such discoveries as may be seen in the works of Professors Thompson, Bertrand Russell, Stieglitz and Lemon in *The Nature of the World and Man*, of Professor Spencer of the Northwestern University, and especially of Sir Oliver Lodge on *Ether and Reality*, it is quite possible that we

may revise the ground for our opinions concerning the Resurrection and the Appearances and the sameness of the body of the Lord. Even if all that is here said be discarded and as a substitute for our ignorance we talk glibly of a spiritual body, still some answer is demanded to such questions as What is the origin of that spiritual body? Where does it come from? What is its essence? Is it a new creation? Is it evolved from the spirit? If the spirit has it already in itself and it is evolved from it, how can it be distinct from the spirit? The nature of the Lord's risen body was, we conclude, spiritualized matter, whether that matter had gradually fallen back into its elementary atoms or was instantly transmuted into higher substance, as Saint Paul declares the bodies of the living shall be transmuted at that day when time's curtain is rung down and a new era under other conditions begins with the redemption of our whole personality and the consequent freedom of the sons of God. "For the whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now waiting for the adoption—the redemption of our bodies."

Not to go further with this, owing to limitations of space, the only ground for this theory which denies the historicity of the Appearances, but admits their subjective quality, is the meaning of the words and their implication as used by Saint Paul: "He was seen—*ὤφθη*—of Cephas"; "He was seen—*ὤφθη*—of me also"; "Have I not seen—*εἶδόν*—the Lord Jesus Christ?" Since these terms commonly denote *seeing in a vision*, Paul, it is assumed, could not have meant that the Appearances to himself were objective, but subjective, as when he says, "It pleased God to reveal his son in me," *ἐν μοί*—in my inner self. The Appearance to Cephas and those recorded in the Gospels were therefore not in the conception of Paul in anywise different, they were not really objective, normal manifestations, but subjective; that is, he did not believe that Christ Jesus rose bodily from the tomb but in a spiritual form only, and this to demonstrate that he was still alive.

These terms, it is quite correct to say, are usually employed in the New Testament as above stated. The inference, however, is by no means warranted that what was seen was always supernatural, phantasmal, beyond sense-perception (John 1. 34-50; 3.

32; Acts 20. 25; Cor. 2. 1; 1 John 1. 13). The context determines the meaning. The Appearances of the Lord are not always designated as visions, that is, the verb *ᾤφθη* above is not the only word used. John 21. 1 says, Jesus *shewed himself*—*ἐπέωσέν αὐτόν*—in such manner, as John goes on to relate, that it is impossible to think of the Appearance as a vision, for the convincing reason that the Jesus who stood before the disciples *spoke* to them, *directed* them where to throw the net, and invited them *to dine* with him; not a very ghostly characteristic. Of course we know what this vision theory will do with that, exclude it as unhistorical, which is always a short cut, and an easy way, to solve difficulties. The apostle, however, states, "This is now the third time that Jesus shewed himself—*εφείπωθη*, *was manifested*—to his disciples after that he was risen from the dead," a sufficient time and opportunity, it would seem, to test the objectivity of the Appearance. If *ᾤφθη* were the only word used in the Gospels and if we could also eliminate the facts with which it is connected, there might be some ground for this vision theory, which, we may note in passing, has been long since rejected as impossible by even such liberal writers as Theodore Keim.

"All these considerations compel us to admit," he says, "that the theory which has recently become the favorite one is only a hypothesis; which, while it explains some things, falls to explain the main substance of the narrations to be dealt with; nay, that it leaves the main facts unexplained, and indeed subordinates what is historically attested to weak and untenable views" (*Jesus Von Nazara*, vol. vi, p. 358).

But what more appropriate terms could be found in the Greek, or in any language, to denote the return to life of one who had been dead and buried? Such terms would not be employed respecting one who had not been dead, and who had not created doubt whether he belonged to this world or the next. To the disciples with whom Jesus conversed, to whom he is sometimes visible, then invisible, unexpectedly coming, and as suddenly departing, living on the border line of two worlds, his *self-manifestations*, not visions created in the ecstatic brains of those who saw him, could not but be termed Appearances. In human bodily form his disciples saw him disappear at the Ascension in the heavens, or,

as Saint Paul states, received up in glory (1 Tim. 3. 1), which statement is further evidence that in the belief of the apostle the Appearances of the Lord were not of a phantasmal, insubstantial nature. It is incredible, if we accept the narratives at all, that the disciples were in an abnormal state of mind at the Ascension, gazing at a fading vision; that the object of their seeing was not a real speaking personality. And in this connection it will be observed that in this instance of the Ascension his going was not sudden, but gradual, stately, as was becoming the grandeur of his triumph, and also, if we may be permitted to say so, as if reluctant to leave the scenes of his earthly experiences and the loving human fellowship of his disciples, for, as Saint John says, "Having loved his own, he loved them to the end." He went *slowly*, as the word *ἐπαθῆ*, not *ἀπαθῆ*, which would suggest quickness of movement, signifies, for, as the Evangelist writes, "While they were gazing steadfastly into heaven as *he was going*," *πορεύμενός αὐτοῦ*. All frivolous comments upon the word "up" criticizing the cosmology of the disciples as if they were attempting to accommodate the locality of heaven to the views of that time (see *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1908, p. 503), ideas derived originally from Babylonian sources, may be dismissed with the classical phrase of a late Harvard professor of psychology, describing a certain theory as folly! Anywhere *from* the earth is "up." Scholars should not forget that Plato puts into the mouth of Socrates an interesting discourse on the rotundity of the earth (see the *Phædo*, 117, Bohn's edition).

If the Appearances of the Lord at the Ascension, therefore, were of a corporeal nature, there is no evidence that his other Appearances were of a different character. Nor is there any evidence of a difference of belief between Saint Paul and the other apostles. *There is nothing in the Gospels which was not first in the church, and there was nothing in the church that Paul did not preach, concerning the Resurrection of the Lord and his Appearances.*

The Appearances were occasional, not consecutive. They did not all occur on the one and the same day, as Professor Schmiedel states they did, closing with the Ascension at night, although such

an erroneous impression might result from the condensed statement of Luke's closing chapter, especially so if one were committed to a definite theory. That Luke had no intention of conveying such a notion is proved by his opening statement in the Acts that Jesus showed himself alive to his disciples after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them—*ὁπτανόμενος αὐτοῖς*—*offering himself to be seen* of them, for forty days, which would bring some of the Appearances, especially the Appearance at the Ascension, within a few days of Pentecost, when the details of the Resurrection were so fresh in Peter's memory and which so mightily arrested public attention. The Appearances could not have all occurred on the same day. Much time was required to communicate the startling news to all the disciples that Jesus was risen from the dead and that they should meet him in Galilee. We cannot assume that these five hundred who did assemble in one body and at a definite time in Galilee all lived at the same place or in near neighborhood. Much time must be allowed also for the scene on the sea shore and its background recorded by John 21. Also for the return of the disciples from Emmaus to Jerusalem, seven and a half miles distant, and this at the time when already the day "was far spent." All these events could not have been crowded into one day.

The Resurrection of our Lord is the best established fact in human history and his Appearances after his resurrection are no less historical, for the same evidence that establishes the one is just as valid for establishing the reality of the other.

"THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESURRECTION FOR ME"

CLARENCE DEAN MARSTON

Cleveland, Ohio

THE significance of the resurrection for me brings up the whole problem of the person of Jesus. What is the significance of the person of Jesus for me? I think we should seek a method and principle by which to deal with the whole matter first. If we can discover a principle that applies to the whole problem of the person of Jesus then we can apply the principle to individual instances.

Let us look for a moment at some of the great Christian doctrines that involve the person of Christ; those that are enumerated in the Apostles' Creed; those in which we reaffirm our belief every Sabbath morning service. Here we find the doctrine of the love of God; the suffering of Christ; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of Christ. These are great doctrines. Why are they great doctrines? Because they are vital to human life. There is the doctrine of the love of God. We cannot live without love. It is absolutely impossible to live in this world without love. Then, to think that God is love, how precious the thought and doctrine! Likewise, the suffering of Christ. We cannot live without suffering. It is as truly a part of our life as love. But Christ was the great sufferer. In him we have an high priest who knows suffering. Likewise, the forgiveness of Christ. Ah, who could live in this world without forgiveness and forgiving? But Christ had more to forgive than anyone else and he forgave freely. Likewise, the resurrection of Christ. We cannot live without a desire to live again. It is probably one of the strongest desires we have. But Christ has accomplished that and has promised it to us and thus it becomes one of the great anchors of our Christian hope and faith. Paul lived by faith upon these great doctrines; the love of God in Christ, the suffering of Christ, the resurrection of Christ. These

are great doctrines because they are vital to human experience. They are Christian doctrines because Christ became the world's greatest lover, the world's greatest sufferer, the world's greatest forgiver and because he achieved immortality. I say these are great Christian doctrines because they meet the highest and most vital needs of human experience. They are the hope of humanity.

But there are other doctrines in the Apostles' Creed which also involve the person of Christ. There is the doctrine of the virgin birth. What does that doctrine mean for us? Well, on the ground of human experience it means nothing to us. We were not born that way. No one here nor anywhere else since Jesus has experienced it, never will, furthermore, has no desire to experience it. The doctrine of the virgin birth meets no high and vital need in human experience. No doctrine is great simply because it can be found in the Bible. A doctrine is a great doctrine only when it is vital to human need and it is sacred only when it meets that need. Who has not experienced moments in his life when he was able to save his soul only by his vision of Jesus on the cross suffering for and forgiving the sins of the world? Or, again, in the lonely hour at the grave by recalling those blessed words: "I am the resurrection and the life!" But frankly, who has ever in the critical moments of life received the strength, help and grace necessary for the test by contemplation of the doctrine of the virgin birth? I dare say, no one. The virgin birth can mean nothing to us on the ground of experience. Therefore, it is not vital to Christian experience. It meets no need. It does not exist in experience. It exists only in theology. It is no aid to Christian experience. It is no aid to faith. It is only a test of faith. "Back of every great Christian doctrine is something by which men have lived; otherwise it is not a great Christian doctrine."

What shall we do then with this doctrine of the virgin birth, reject it? My conviction is that it ought never to have been elevated to the position of a doctrine but should remain in its rightful place in the story of the nativity of Jesus. It is one of the many miracles that make up that beautiful story. It is the annunciation of the angels to Mary. There is also the annunciation of the angels to the shepherds. Why exalt one to the dignity of the

creed and not the other? There is another beautiful miracle in the story of the nativity, the miracle of the star. Why not make that a matter of creed? Because it has no significance for us in experience. We know that God will never lead us to Christ by a star. Most of us don't know enough about the stars to follow one. But we know that we are led and that we find him just as surely as the Wise Men from the East found him. Let us apply the same principle to the doctrine of the physical resurrection. What does it mean for us in human experience? The three following doctrines included in the Apostles' Creed—the virgin birth, the physical resurrection, and the bodily translation of Jesus—may all be measured by one rod, what do they mean for human experience? No one of us has ever experienced any one of them, ever will.

What does the resurrection of Jesus mean to me? It certainly does not mean anything biologically. According to the records and the creed, "He was dead, and buried; the third day he rose from the dead." His body did not suffer decomposition. "Dust thou art, to dust returnest" was not the case with Jesus' body but it will be with mine. Therefore, plainly, Jesus' resurrection can have no biological significance for me.

What shall we do then with the virgin birth, the physical resurrection, and the bodily ascension of Jesus, throw them overboard? Certainly not. Let them take their place in history along with the many other miracles that accompanied early Christianity. They have served their purpose. "Faith grew and the necessity for miracle ceased." If we haven't anything better in Christianity than biological miracles to carry over into the twentieth century then we haven't much that we can use. Physical miracles would be no aid to Christian faith to-day. They would be a hindrance. It is a common expression: "If we only had enough faith we could see miracles to-day." But that is not the case. Our faith in Jesus Christ has grown beyond the miracle stage. He no longer has to turn water into wine to inspire our faith. We have seen miracles that far surpass the miracles at Cana of Galilee. We have seen stony hearts turned into hearts of flesh. We have seen heathen tribes sunken down in superstition and brutality turned into intelligent worshiping congregations. Faith has grown through

and out of the stage of physical miracles into the stage of the miracles of grace.

Shall we do away with the creeds and ancient declarations of faith? No, they have meant too much to our past. They have done a service, they have met a need. There was a need for them, otherwise they would not have been formulated. No one who has any appreciation of the history that surged about the year 325 can read the Apostles' Creed without a profound sense of awe and reverence. Think of the courage of those Christian leaders who dared to take into their hands the shaping of a creed in the face of a theological storm so violent that some of the baser controversialists resorted to physical force.

Shall we revise the creeds? No, let them stand as a perfect record of our past. They represent the courage and sincerity of our fathers. They are the monuments of their building in the temple of faith. "Therefore, let their work stand as theirs." Let us be inspired by their example to undertake with equal courage and sincerity the task of our day. "We justify and revere the spirit in which the creeds were written." They have met a need in the history of the church. But they were never intended to bar out from us the light and life that comes from a higher spiritual development and the general advance of civilization and science (Carus, *God*, p. 133). At best, all the Christian doctrines are but symbols; they are shells in which we try to carry the content. The content is the living truth of Christianity and it is constantly outgrowing its shell. But every outgrown shell is a testimony to the progress of the living truth among men. The following illustrates this. Recently the Christian Chinese met in conference at Shanghai and presented to the missionaries the following memorial: "We express our regret that we are divided by the denominationalism that comes to us from the West. . . . Instead of being a source of inspiration this denominationalism has been and still continues to be a source of confusion, bewilderment, and inefficiency. We Christian Chinese desire to effect a speedy unity and we call upon the missionaries to remove the obstacles" (*Christian Century*, January 17, 1924).

Here we have a lot of Christian Chinese. Some of them were

led into the Christian life by the gospel message as it came to them through the doctrines and forms of faith that one denomination stresses, others of them by the doctrines and forms of faith that another denomination stresses, and still others by still other denominations. But in the end they find themselves one in faith. This shows us in a striking way that back of forms is the real. Back of every sincere statement about God is God. Of course, the point stressed in the Christian Century in the above instance is the fact that the Christian Chinese desire to come to a unity of form, but for our use of this concrete example the significant thing is that whatever the form and however different the forms they lead at last to the unity of faith. In view of this, it seems to me, we could afford to be less tenacious in our contention for certain stated doctrines. Back of all we say about Christ is Christ. Every sincere effort leads to him. He is easy of access. Is it necessary to insist upon such materialistic things as the bodily resurrection, the bodily ascension, the virgin birth? Those things appeal, of course, to the materialist, but all are not of that type of mind. David Livingstone states in his journals that he found great difficulty in making the Africans believe in a physical resurrection. He tells of an instance when he was telling one day the story of the life of Jesus to which they listened eagerly, but when he came to the resurrection and told them they too would be raised from the grave they rebelled. One named Lerimo said: "This I won't believe." But Livingstone regained his attention by telling him that if he did not believe then the guilt lay between him and Christ. The doctrine of the physical resurrection was to this poor black man not an aid to his faith but an obstacle.

Personally, I am afraid of materialistic evidences in things spiritual. I could never be convinced by the method that spiritualism employs, for no matter how wonderful the "appearance" I should always be wondering if after all they didn't deceive my senses. I have been fooled many times in colors and in the magnitude of bodies. Thomas doubted the physical resurrection and insisted upon a material proof. I shall be afraid to trust my faith in Christianity or the resurrection upon the simple proof that Thomas demanded. And this is my serious conviction that if

Thomas had been granted only the materialistic proof he demanded he would have gone away and upon reflection would have become very skeptical concerning the genuineness of the appearance. Jesus saith to Thomas: "Reach hither thy hand." Thomas answered: "My Lord and my God!" But I cannot believe that it was the mere physical evidence that brought forth the "My Lord and my God!" from the heart and lips of Thomas and sent him out never to doubt again but to serve faithfully and at last die a martyr's death for his Lord and his God. I believe that when Thomas drew near to make his investigation he experienced the same blessed spiritual illumination that the two who walked to Emmaus experienced when "their eyes were opened and they knew him"; the same spiritual illumination that Mary experienced when as she talked with Jesus, supposing him to be the gardener, and "Jesus saith unto her, Mary, and she saith unto him, Rabboni!"; the same spiritual illumination that the eleven experienced when they were gathered together in their midst, "then opened he their mind that they might understand"; the same spiritual transformation that Paul received on the road to Damascus when his physical eyes were blinded but he heard the voice of the Christ speaking unto him in the Hebrew tongue. Christ's resurrection was a spiritual resurrection and only those who were spiritually discerned beheld him in his resurrection glory. Why did Jesus not appear to Pilate, to Herod? They were not spiritually prepared to discern him. Even Mary, the two on the road to Emmaus, the eleven had to ask: "Who art thou?" when he appeared to them. It is even so to-day. Christ strives to enter into our consciousness. To those who sincerely draw near and inquire: "Who art thou?" he will manifest himself.

"Let sense be dumb, let flesh retire:
Speak through the earthquake, wind and fire,
Oh, still small voice of calm!"

The compelling evidences of the resurrection are not material but spiritual, and if they are spiritual then they are spiritually discerned. I resent the common parlance that classes all the liberal-minded among the back-slidden and spiritual degenerates.

I believe that every true investigation of the resurrection will culminate in a more and more emphatic "My Lord and my God!" I can truthfully say it is so with me.

It is not the emptiness of Christ's tomb but the fullness and completeness of Christ's life that are the compelling evidences of his resurrection.

The fullness and completeness of his life. Jesus said, and he lived all that he said, "Love one another," "Bless them that curse you and pray for them that despitefully use you," "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword," "Resist not him that is evil: but whoever smiteth thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also," "Blessed are the peace makers." Nearly two thousand years have passed over the earth since Jesus spoke and lived those words and yet just last summer a man over in India drew from his pocket a little book and handed it to Bishop Fred B. Fisher of the Methodist Church. It was the New Testament. Bishop Fisher looked at it and handed it back to the man and said, "Ghandi, do you believe in Christ?" Ghandi replied: "If you mean the Christ of Christianity, I do not. But if you mean the Christ of the Beatitudes, the Christ of peace and love, the Christ of John's Gospel, then I do with all my heart and some day I shall bring all India to serve him." The ideals as they were breathed forth in the words and life of Jesus have become the ideals and motive force of the greatest religious leader in the world to-day. The immortality of the ideals of Christ and their power to set fire to the souls of men and women down through the ages is the compelling evidence and power of his resurrection. Mahatma Ghandi, the Quakers, the saints and martyrs of the ages, these rather than the empty tomb and the "appearances" are the convicting evidences of Christ's resurrection. Truly, "Our apostolic message is not, 'The Lord was raised,' but, 'The Lord lives.'" Jesus said: "The words that I speak they are life and spirit." We are convinced of the truth of it. His words live. They are virile, living, and powerful to-day. His ideals are far in advance of all others. The words that he spoke, the ideals he set forth, the life he lived are the ideals of all that is good and holy in the world to-day. In spirit, though not always in name, he is at the head of every great

and good cause among men. Such are the compelling evidences of the resurrection and the significance of it all for us is that if we make the ideals of the Christ our ideals, make his life our life, his spirit our spirit, then we shall share in their immortality. Such is the power and the glory of the resurrection that I find in Christ.

Faith in the resurrection is far more significant to us than belief in the empty tomb. An Easter faith rather than an Easter story must be the appeal that will find men's hearts to-day. And we can find evidences for that faith fresher at hand than to have to go back 2,000 years to those that the apostles proclaimed. We have the same faith but we have fresher and more compelling evidences, that is, more compelling to us, than the empty tomb. It would be a weak faith, indeed, a dead faith, that for 2,000 years had produced no evidences of its life. But not so, it is "faith of our fathers living still," and there are compelling evidences of its life on every hand; evidences that will compel every honest doubter and investigator to yield up the confession of his heart: "My Lord and my God!"

THE LARGER EASTER

O Christ Divine! "the holiest
Among the mighty, and the mightiest
Among the holy," be thy name,
Thy glorious name, enthroned in every breast.

The powers of darkness, blessèd King,
In vain thy cause and rightful rule assail;
Against thy Church the gates of Hell,
Howe'er they rage, shall never, Lord, prevail.

The fortresses of cruel might
Thou overthrowest with thy piercèd hand,
And from thy cross dost evermore
Our grateful hearts and eager wills command.

In brighter and still broadening day,
With love that heals earth's bitterest grief and strife,
Extends thy everlasting sway,
O Thou who art the world's true Light and Life!

BENJAMIN COPELAND.

Buffalo, N. Y.

IMMORTALITY ?

(An investigation into the foundations of man's belief in the doctrine of "Conscious Personal Survival" of bodily death)

ALLEN BACON

Stockton, Cal.

THE doctrine of immortality has not lacked supporters these thousands of years. Their names have been legion. The time has come to put vain sentimentality, human pride, egotism, even superstition, in their rightful place. The proposition must stand, when approached in the light of human reason, strictly on its own merits.

Man has never yet applied to the problems which most profoundly concern him—namely, whether or no his personality involves any element which can survive bodily death—those methods of inquiry which in attacking all other problems he has found most efficacious. But the reason is self-evident—the familiar "scientific method" concerns itself with data which we are made aware of through the senses and which will appear the same to all observers, whereas philosophers tell us that in fields of thought dealing with our interpretation of data, or Reality itself, unanimity of opinion is impossible and exact experimental data which will tally, in all cases and with all observers, cannot be obtained.

Whence came this doctrine, this idea of man's immortality? All of the great religions of the world have embodied it, in some form or other, in their teaching. The idea is not a recent one in the history of the race. It is as primitive, as ancient as man himself. In the early childhood of the race man began to be aware of a mystery quite unexplainable by any formula that he had thus far evolved through the coordinating of other data of his everyday experience. He seemed to possess another self or "person" within himself. I know of no better illustration of this psychological phenomenon in primitive man's awakening self-consciousness than in *Waterloo's Story of Ab*, where Ab encounters his companion, Oak, in a dream shortly after they had fought, as rival lovers, and Oak had been killed. Such subconscious mani-

festations as this soon became the common experience of the race after man had come into his mental and spiritual heritage, and were naturally interpreted as first-hand evidence—nay, absolute proof—that man had an “immortal soul” which was not only independent of the body but which survived it after the catastrophe which we call death. Here we have then the beginning of this bugaboo, this superstition founded upon naught but a naïve gratuitous assumption, this veritable family skeleton, as it were, which has haunted man down through the ages.

In the *Encyclopædia Britannica* we find the word “immortality” defined thus: “The condition or quality of being exempt from death or annihilation.” However, the term has come to have, with the majority of people, a much more limited meaning. For my purpose it will not be necessary for me to quote a number of authors and texts in order to establish my point. Any one of my readers can undoubtedly supply copious additional data. Most standard texts dealing with the problem of personal immortality are quite frank and explicit in their statement of the question. They all agree in substance, thus: “An immortality which is not *personal* is *nothing*. We are not immortal unless our *personality* can survive the shock of death.” Here we certainly have a definite, clear-cut statement, eliminating, as we see, without ceremony the view advanced by the positivists that “immortality” may mean merely a sort of “influence” which the individual exerts, during his life, upon his environment, and which persists after his death in the lives of those with whom he has come in contact. I take it, then, that all are agreed that any consideration of this subject must be based upon the definition of “immortality” as being “conscious, *personal* survival.”

Now let us consider a few of the arguments which have been advanced from time to time in support of this obsession which has dogged the human race for thousands of generations. First of all we find this statement, attributed to no less an authority than Ralph Waldo Emerson: “The impulse to seek proof of immortality is itself the strongest proof of all.” Upon analysis this statement appears so amazing as to be scarcely credible as coming from such a scholar as Emerson. Accepting this as an “argument,” then

exactly the same thing can be advanced in favor of witchcraft, which was believed in most fervently by the entire human race for hundreds of thousands of years and which thousands of high-minded and otherwise intelligent souls through the ages have endeavored most zealously and piously to prove—and indeed did succeed in proving, to their own satisfaction, at least. Exactly this same proof can be offered as to the authenticity of the Virgin Birth, let us say, or the physical resurrection, or any one of the numerous questions now in dispute in the theological world; for have not the “inspired” theologians of past generations endeavored, in a frenzy of religious fanaticism, to establish beyond question the *proofs* of these things, even going so far in some cases as to introduce gratuitous interpolations into the texts of some of the original manuscripts? Rather is it not the reverse that is true, in our everyday experience? Does not a multiplicity of arguments, or so-called “proofs,” all equally plausible, or flimsy and unsubstantial, as the case may be, really weaken a cause, instead of strengthen it? With all due respect to Emerson, his so-called argument appears quite untenable in the light of pure reason and common sense.

In examining the rather wide field of literature devoted to this subject, we find that the arguments in support of the doctrine of immortality fall rather naturally into four groups, or classes. These can be briefly enumerated as follows:

1. Traditional arguments.
2. Rational arguments.
3. Emotional arguments.
4. Volitional arguments.

Let us take up in turn some of the evidence introduced and examine it for what it is worth. Under the heading of “traditional” arguments appear considerable data, most of which, frankly, is of the type which would make its appeal to people who do little independent thinking of their own and who are quite willing to accept, in matters of religion and morals, the word of other individuals, or of institutions, whose authority they trust. These data include the following points, all apparently deemed of sufficient merit to receive consideration:

1. The fact of the Resurrection of Jesus.
2. The teaching of the Bible.
3. The teaching of Jesus.
4. The “Doctrine of Immortality,” and the teaching of the church.

All of these points are more or less involved one with the other and all mean practically the same thing, to wit: We are to believe in man's immortality because we are *told* that it is so. And the strength of our belief will depend entirely upon our confidence in the absolute infallibility of our instructors. This, I think, needs no further discussion. However, in this connection there is one passage in the New Testament which we often hear quoted and which is used—or misused—possibly more than any other passage of Scripture as furnishing proof positive of the doctrine—it is, in fact, the heavy artillery in the battle of the faithful with the non-believers. I refer to the words attributed to Jesus, "In my Father's house are many mansions," etc. Now, even assuming that this passage in our English texts is the most perfect and the most exact translation or equivalent of the identical, specific words which Jesus himself spoke (and all of us, realizing the many complications and "margins of error" involved—the fallibility of translators and copyists, and the lapse of time between the spoken and the written word—are aware that we are here on footing which is slippery, not to say precarious)—waiving all this, the fact remains that it is difficult to find any two people who will agree to just what the words themselves actually mean. The word "mansions" immediately suggests the old anthropomorphic concept of a heaven of golden streets, pearly gates, etc., but even our friends the Fundamentalists now tell us that heaven is not a place but a "state of mind" or a "condition." But if the words are not to be taken literally, then they must have an allegorical significance, in which case they may mean anything under the shining heavens!

Under the head of rational arguments we find data which on casual inspection seem fairly plausible but which also fail to stand the acid test of careful analysis and cold logic. These arguments are subdivided, by some writers, into negative and positive arguments. Among the former group, the only one worthy of mention here is the statement that "we must adopt the theory which will get us the farthest in the art of living." This I will grant freely—the only point upon which I take issue is the particular theory which is adopted! Here we have involved one of the vital issues of the whole question. But inasmuch as this point will be

gone into more fully later in my summary, I will not deal further with it at this time. Under the head of "positive arguments" are several points which it will be necessary to deal with separately. First, we have the statement that "continuity of consciousness goes back beyond any of the transformations of the life of the body." Of course it does—it goes back vastly farther than that—it goes back to the amoeba, or for all we know, to the primeval fire mist. But what does that prove? Not a single thing except that conscious living organisms are able to reproduce and to perpetuate themselves. It does not, of course, prove that *dead* cells or organisms are able to reproduce, nor does it prove, or even suggest in any way, that consciousness continues after the death of the cell or organism from which it emanated. To say that consciousness does so continue is a purely gratuitous hypothesis, and is based upon not one single shred of data or evidence whatsoever. Again, we are told, "We are liberated from the body from which we started (physiological transformations) and thus we have shown our power to survive." Yes—and each time "we" became liberated from the old body, or cells, and survived, it was because the body, or organism, continued to be made up of *living* cells, not *dead* tissue, and it was because of this living tissue that "we" were able to continue as living, conscious entities. Again, the old axiom of the "indestructibility of mind and matter" is quoted, as though it had something to do with the question involved. First of all, the term "mind," in the sense that it is here used, must be clearly defined and understood. Are we simply talking about "the mind," which we associate with ordinary human beings, and which the *Century Dictionary* defines in various ways, such as "the conscious subject, the ego, the soul," or "the intellect, or cognitive faculty or part of the soul, as distinguished from feeling and volition," or "the field of consciousness"—is this the "mind" which is referred to as being indestructible? Or is the "Mind" which we are considering spelled with a capital "M," with the prefix "divine" implied, and the term intended really to represent merely another one of our many feeble anthropomorphic attempts to label our concept of the Deity? If the former definitions are to be accepted, then I challenge the validity of the above axiom. When Rome

said, "*Carthago delenda est*," what did she mean? When she carried out her threat, just what was accomplished? What was it that was destroyed? The stones with which her temples and palaces were constructed? We know that they were not. But whatever it was that actually happened, we do know that the agglomeration of buildings and individuals which combined together to make up the entity or organism which was known as the city of Carthage, that mighty force and personality which for a time threatened the supremacy of Rome herself—that organism was obliterated, annihilated, completely, permanently. Carthage *was* destroyed. And in like manner every human organism, with all its bodily and mental powers and functions, every individual "field of consciousness," every personality, every "mind" (with a small "m") as an individual entity possessing memory and consciousness—all this will be destroyed, just as Carthage was destroyed. Will *anything* be left, after the destruction? Undoubtedly, for the positivists are right, after all; the influence of the personality on its environment, during its lifetime, can never be effaced. But whether or not anything still remains will probably be a much mooted question for a long time to come. And philosophers must have *something* to argue about! There is, however, a fallacious type of reasoning which is amazingly common. Otherwise thoughtful people will argue that because the human mind has the power, as in telepathy and thought transference, to emanate a force of some kind which will operate upon some other mind at a distance, therefore our minds are not dependent *at all* upon our bodies. We know, however, that whereas an electro-magnet has the power to send out vibrations which will operate upon other matter at a distance, these vibrations cease immediately when anything occurs to destroy the magnet's attractive power. Shut off the current and where is it? As an electro-magnet it has certainly lost its "soul," its "ego." It has died. True, the current is still there, on tap. It has not been destroyed. Which leads us to speculate; when a man dies, perchance there *is* some residue left over. Maybe Plato was right after all—though not in the way in which he imagined—and man is made up of "body, soul and spirit," the first two of the earth, earthy, the last named represent-

ing the guiding principle, the life spark which animates both body and soul, as well as all organic nature. But all we we can say with any certainty, right now, is, "We do not know."

Again, we are told that "this life is incomplete," and the so-called "moral quality" of the universe is invoked to remedy the situation by giving man another chance in the next world and so maintaining an equilibrium, as it were. This curious bit of reasoning (?) seems so quaint and naïve that it is with diffidence that one brings it up for serious discussion among readers accustomed to independent thinking. It seems rather pertinent to ask at this point, "What are the standards of morality by which we, the creatures of this universe, do sit thus in judgment on our Creator?" We have only two alternatives—we must either judge our so-called "moral" universe according to our present-day concepts and criteria, in which case it becomes a mere anthropomorphism, a product, as it were, of our own minds and possessing the attributes of our human finiteness and perspective—or else we must judge by some standards which will be extant, let us say, 10,000 years hence—or, forsooth, a million years hence—and who knows what those standards will be? And even if we knew, would those standards necessarily be final? *There seems to be a peculiar kink, or twist, in man's ego, which impels him to adopt as axiomatic and final the judgments and concepts which he has evolved in his limited contact with reality, and to carry these over into the metaphysical realm and apply them there, as smugly and complacently as a carpenter measuring off a piece of lumber.* "What fools we mortals be!" I recall my early childhood concept of God as being a tall man in a flowing robe, with heavy beard, and kindly twinkling eyes. This concept possesses certain advantages, primitive though it may be—especially with reference to the twinkling eyes, for if God does not have a sense of humor, how can he tolerate such a silly, irrational, egotistical race of beings?

In his volume entitled *Exploratio Evangelica*, Dr. Percy Gardner, the author, has this to say:

My position is that if we begin by hastily assuming what is reasonable and righteous, and then expect to find the will of God as revealed in the world to conform to our views, we may be disappointed. . . . It may

be a matter of belief, though it can never be a matter of scientific knowledge, that the processes of nature embody the will of God. But from the humble psychological point of view, the phrase "will of God," however useful and, indeed, indispensable, is in fact only a phrase "thrown out at" a vast spiritual reality, and it is not justifiable to suppose that in any given respect that reality is like the human will. We must draw a strong line of distinction between the working of God in nature, and the divine working through man and the human will (Preface, pp. 7, 8, 9).

In the next group of arguments, listed as the "Emotional Group," the most important point dealt with seems to be the one referred to as "The essential worth of the self." Now here, I am aware, we have the argument upon which the philosophers and other heavy thinkers seem to place the most stress. Most men of profound wisdom and immense erudition appear to have adopted it as the major issue, as it were, in the problem of immortality. In a recent lecture, a noted philosopher said to this effect: "It is impossible to postulate an evolutionary process which develops a personality such as we know man to possess to-day, and then proceeds to snuff it out like a candle; such a thing is incompatible with our concept of a rational universe." Here we have that egotistical kink in man's make-up to which I referred a moment ago, asserting itself in its most virulent form. Just because *we* think our stupid, human "personalities" are the most valuable and precious things in the universe, and must *of course* be preserved for all time—like biological specimens in a jar or behind a glass case—we proceed to complacently take it for granted that the Almighty feels the same way about it! First we adopt as a premise the entirely gratuitous assumption that man's petty little "ego" is the most priceless thing on record and the final crowning achievement of the evolutionary process—an assumption founded solely and entirely upon man's selfish, childish egotism—and upon that premise we postulate that the destruction of the "ego" or "personality" is incompatible with a rational universe! Verily, brothers, this be some reasoning!

Seriously, where *did* we mortals ever get the idea that our personal entities, our egos, or personalities, possess an intrinsic value, independent of our relations as individuals to other individuals, and are worthy of being preserved for all time to come? Where did we get the idea? One glance at Nature conducting her

everyday affairs should convince us of our error. For Nature—or divine purpose—as you choose—in achieving her ends, does so, be it observed, *by means of individuals*, but the individuals themselves are not the end in view, for Nature is exceedingly lavish and sacrifices the individuals with enormous, and seemingly in some cases, wanton, prodigality, in order to achieve her ends. Dr. H. Wildon Carr in a recent lecture made very clear the point that “individuals are a *means* and not an *end*, in the evolutionary process.” He also admitted, when the question was pressed, that the terms “individual” and “personality” were synonymous in the sense that all individuals possess personality, in infinitely varying degrees. But why do we continue so persistently to stress the intrinsic worth of the human soul, and insist that a discarnate spirit possesses some “in-itself” value which must be reckoned with? Many thinkers are beginning to adopt the other view. Alexander, for example, finds no place for individual immortality in his system. In his *Space, Time and Deity*, Book 4, page 423, he says:

“The mere desire that we feel, to be present in ourselves and to continue our work begun here, admirable as it is because the passion to do things ourselves is at the root of all our endeavors, cannot overrule the facts of our apparent limitations to the time and place of our bodily life. [And a little farther on he says:] The belief in immortality is founded upon an erroneous prejudice, a prejudice in favor of one's own person. But the conservation of value need not necessarily mean the persistence of the valuable individual. *Human ideals may be perpetuated by the species although each individual as such should utterly perish, and we should be content with the continuance of the species rather than of persons.* And if the mere continuance of human ideals does not satisfy us (for nature may involve the physical destruction of the mind) there is the other and higher satisfaction of thinking that the persistence of our human effort in tradition is doing the work of preparing deity, according to the well-justified phrase, “in God's good time,” and, it must be added, place. God is, if we may use such language, the power which makes for deity. It is because we ourselves make for righteousness that we have faith in the further nîsus of the universe, and are sustained by that sentiment so as to derive help from it in doing righteousness. *Our minds and the values they create do not end the series of empirical qualities.* Our virtue is only part of the presupposition on which depends the emergence of the next higher quality to mind which we call deity. [The italics are mine.]

The fourth and last group of arguments which should be con-

sidered is the "Volitional Group." Strictly speaking, none of these are in any sense arguments in support of the doctrine of immortality or attempts to offer proof of same. They merely represent reasons why man has *desired* immortality in the past, and, presumably, will continue to do so in the future. But it must be said that the personal equation enters into the matter at this point. Individuals certainly differ in the nature of their response to the same stimuli—so the psychologist would put it. Or, as President Lincoln once expressed it, when a friend of his asked his opinion of a certain dog which they were discussing, "Well, if a person liked, that kind of a dog, I should think it would be just about that kind of a dog he'd like!" And so it is with man's desire for a future life, particularly in the case of the so-called "mystic desire." It could hardly be expected that all individuals would adopt the same attitude on this. Of course if one still preserved intact his childhood concept of a Deity possessing various human attributes and characteristics, then it would be no more than a normal impulse for such an individual to desire to "see him face to face." As for the other points—the "desire for service," the "desire to be with friends," the "dislike of annihilation of life," etc.—these merely represent certain impulses, highly laudable in themselves, even ethical, let us grant, which have guided the race in its long upward climb. *If a man chooses to postulate that because many of his deepest impulses, his yearnings and longings for the unattainable, have during his lifetime culminated more often in frustration than in fruition, and that immediately upon the shuffling off of this mortal coil, presto! a miracle will happen and he will find all of life's injustices righted and his fondest hopes and dreams realized—if man chooses to thus place himself at the mercy of a wholly gratuitous assumption, he will have no one but himself to blame for any ill which may result from his childish folly.*

It is indeed a curious spectacle to observe the attitude of individuals otherwise normal, sane, broadminded, and of wide culture, individuals of what we may term the "intellectual class," on this question of human immortality. These individuals pride themselves on being "modern" and "liberal" in all their thinking—in religious, social and political matters. They readily consult the

scientist and accept his word as authority on all matters pertaining to the operations of natural laws, as far as they have been revealed to us. They are free in their criticism of any references to the miraculous or the supernormal contained in the Scriptures or elsewhere, insisting that they have entirely freed themselves from such intellectual bondage and superstition. They know that all our much-vaunted human knowledge is limited to phenomena which we are made aware of through the senses; that each individual, objective field of consciousness is brought into an awareness not only of its own existence but of the existence of other fields of consciousness, through the instrumentality of an external, sensual, phenomenal world. Yet they seem to assume that this same sensual, phenomenal world will continue to function, will continue to impinge itself upon their objective consciousness after its line of communications has been severed, or in other words, after the senses have ceased to function, through the death of the body. Their whole argument—if it can be called that—is based upon the absurd assumption that the individual entity—or soul, if you will—will continue to be aware of an objective world of things, of phenomena, after the destruction of those vital functions of the body upon which the sensual apprehension of phenomena is absolutely dependent. These people cannot entirely give up the idea of the miraculous or supernatural. They seem unable to accept the biological fact of life and death, but expect a miracle, forsooth, to intervene and save their precious souls from annihilation. We are told that there exists in man a “spontaneous, instinctive, dynamic, universal belief in immortality.” We grant all that freely, but who among us insists that *the only possible interpretation of that instinct involves a biological miracle?* Man possesses other vital instincts which, while they have undoubtedly been of crucial importance in the past in connection with the evolutionary process, he has not only learned are no longer fundamentally vital to his further development, but are capable of adaptation, modification, or even eventual elimination. When ecto-genesis becomes a fact—and its eventual adoption on a planetary scale seems only a matter of time—what significance will the “reproductive instinct” assume in the scheme of things? And has not the “instinct of self-

preservation," formerly of absolutely vital significance for the survival of the species, been greatly curbed and modified by our modern concepts of altruism and the spirit of self-sacrifice and service to one's fellow man which we recognize are the very keynote and essence of our modern interpretation of the teaching of Jesus? And what about this so-called "instinct of immortality"? In all our scientific investigations we have simply confirmed and demonstrated over and over again that Nature's laws are inexorable, that they always operate the same under identical conditions, and we now accept it as axiomatic that life (or consciousness, or personality, as we understand the terms) is an attribute of, or a function or a quality of, or emanates from living, organic matter. Why do we insist that an exception be made to this law in the case of man only, among all of Nature's living creatures? Of course there be some who take the view that *all* living creatures possess the attribute of immortality, in proportion to the stage of consciousness or personality to which they have evolved—but this, instead of clarifying matters, only complicates them. It only illustrates what a supreme muddle man can make of things when he abandons his innate powers of pure, dispassionate reasoning and launches into speculation in the endeavor to bolster up a theory based on an inborn prejudice.

Come now, let us reason together. Granted that man has this "spontaneous, instinctive belief" in immortality, and granted that their belief has served as an intelligible working formula during the early stages in man's development, during the period when his psychology was of the simple, naïve, childlike sort—granted that during this period in man's development, which we may term the "pre-scientific" stage, this belief or formula has been of vital—even indispensable—service in furthering the nisus of the universe, as regards that small speck of it represented by our planet, are we afraid to face the real truth as to man's estate and destiny, now that we are, in a sense, prepared to know the facts? Are we going to continue handing out for the edification of our youth a system of teaching at which their reason revolts? For it is a fact which we may as well face: the average boy and girl of to-day, of high-school and college age, looks out upon life, faces its problems and

forms his judgments from the rational scientific viewpoint. There is no room in the mental horizons of these sane, healthy youngsters for the old orthodoxy and mysticism, for the superstitions and outworn dogmas and formulas of yesterday. And yet what is the situation?—from pulpit and lecture platform, in the classrooms of colleges and universities, we still hear the old interpretation given to this mysterious side of man's nature, this "instinct of immortality," old formulas, with all their pitiful inconsistencies and incongruities, poured out *ad absurdum* and *ad nauseam*, in the futile attempt to foist mediæval superstition upon twentieth century enlightenment. We all know the result when a witness in court makes one single statement which is later found to be false; the entire testimony is vitiated. *The only wonder is that our youth, after a course of moral and religious teaching in which their whole intelligence and reasoning powers are thrown into revolt, do not become atheists or gross materialists. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free!"*

The positivists undoubtedly have much that we can learn to our advantage. Our modern concept of the Deity simply represents a certain stage in the progress of our religious experience, which any thinking person must admit will some day be superseded by a higher concept, and this by a still higher. Is there anyone who possesses the boldness, the hardihood, to declare that our present limited, biased, anthropomorphic interpretation of this mystic "instinct of immortality" represents the final, complete statement of the ultimate truth? Rather, does not our present interpretation of this instinct merely represent our feeble attempt to supply a working formula for something which would otherwise be an inexplicable enigma, and that higher concepts will be revealed as one age unfolds upon another and man attains higher spirituality?

A nightingale is a beautiful singer, but, lovely though his song may be, we cannot conceive of his possessing the power to apprehend or appreciate the significance or the spiritual message embodied, let us say, in a Beethoven symphony. Man is as a nightingale. Out under the stars he sings his song and feels himself in tune with the Infinite, a part of Reality itself. Can he hear

the glorious harmony from the mighty orchestra? Yes, but only as he hears the rustle of the leaves, or the songs of other creatures about him like himself. To him the majestic symphony is merely a mighty wind blowing, or mayhap a roaring cataract-phenomena of nature with which he is familiar.

The more one ponders upon a subject such as this the more one's awe increases at the stupendous nature of the problem and the breath-catching implications involved. Man is moving forward in a mighty drama, toward an ultimate destiny of which he has as yet caught but a fleeting glimmer.

EASTER HYMN

Christ is arisen,
 Joy to thee, mortal!
 Out of his prison,
 Forth from its portal!
 Christ is not sleeping,
 Seek him no longer!
 Strong was his keeping,
 Jesus was stronger.

Christ is arisen,
 Seek him not here;
 Lonely his prison,
 Empty his bier;
 Vain his entombing,
 Spices and lawn,
 Vain the perfuming,
 Jesus is gone.

Christ is arisen,
 Joy to thee, mortal!
 Empty his prison,
 Broken its portal!
 Rising he giveth
 His shroud to the sod;
 Risen, he liveth,
 And liveth to God.

From the Easter Hymn in *Faust*, by GOETHE.

THE PASSION AND THE CROSS

FREDERICK M. BILLINGS

New York City, N. Y.

By the Passion the writer understands the Lord's purpose, and by the Cross the interferences with that purpose. This purpose was as old as the words to the serpent which had troubled Eden, that its head would be bruised by the seed of the woman. The Lord's continuing purpose is indicated in many places in both Testaments. It may be that one or more of the texts quoted below are doubtful to the modern critic. But they are given as being fair samples, representatives of the general Bible message, which is the affirmation of a God who cares for men, who teaches men, who is able to do both. It is true that the Old Testament is concerned directly with the Jewish people, who were for many centuries the predecessors of the Christians as a religious center, and true also that many statements in the Bible are hard to be understood. Jesus spoke in parables, and did not draw attention to their setting, whether that was historic or not, but to the lessons involved. He referred to Jonah's temporary captivity in the waters in forecasting his own coming trials. Negation of all unusual happenings comes very near to denial of religion, as far as that affirms the presence of "a power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness," but the essential is that we try to protect what we have gained from the tendency to deny, from the serpent that beguiled Eve.

Just what form the Divine care took, age by age, we are not now concerned with, but rather with the Passion, the Intent, to maintain some positive recognition by men. Isaiah wrote, "Jehovah cometh in strength, he shall feed his flock like a shepherd" (40. 10, 11). "I am Jehovah, and beside me there is no Saviour" (43. 11). These and many similar verses are thought of as referring to Jesus, and probably formed part of his talk to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus.

It may be well here to refer to the attempt to stay the Modern-

ists, who denied the Divine birth of Jesus in the days of Constantine. They were opposed by active Fundamentalists, but one result of the contest was to dethrone the Apostles' Creed, which was satisfactory and short, for the Nicene Creed, and then the Athanasian Creeds, which were long and mysterious. As a result, there came the assertion of a Son of God, born from eternity, as preceding the "only begotten Son," born of Mary, in time. The thought of Incarnation does not involve that of separation, it indicates the Divine presence in descent to where it is needed by men. The birth of a son to a man means division, one more recipient of life from the Divine, separated from the father's own life. The birth and earth life of Jesus was not on this wise. He affirmed frequently that the Father was within him, in fact that his inner, essential life was that of the Father, of the one God. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father."

The Divine intent to save men brought about the Passion when the great conflict came, in the fullness of time. Where did this conflict take place? Where could Redeeming Love reach the evil conditions that infected men? The answer is not difficult, and it is in agreement, word for word, with the Gospel stories and with the Old Testament prophecies, as in Isaiah 53. "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows . . . wounded for our transgressions . . . bruised for our iniquities . . . with his stripes we are healed . . . the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all."

Putting this into to-day's phrasing, an ovum from a woman, who inherited the complex Jewish nature, became the means of descent for the Divine presence to the conditions into which the world had sunk.

There was no interference with the Divine care of the lilies or the sparrows; these and the other myriads of dependents were maintained in being; but, for a few years, there was growing in the Near East a child, and then a man, who is described as a man of sorrows, but to him was given, after temptations, "all power in heaven and on earth."

There were temptations, and through that experience of temptation to the Son of man the conquest became possible. It is

because of the victory by the human in him that he was made perfect through suffering and thus became one with the Divine within him, which he called the Father.

In Gethsemane and on the cross the Son of man overcame in his last contest. When he prayed in the garden that the cup might pass from him, it was not from fear of the pains of crucifixion, nor of the ridicule of the fickle crowds in and around Jerusalem. He had been in temptations oft, and knew something of the inevitable strain of the final struggle, which would bring a separation, apparent only, but in consciousness, real, from the Divine within him; and his words are recorded, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Men have known something like this in their valleys of the shadow of death, which are almost as nothing in comparison with his.

When he said, "It is finished," there was nothing left of the merely human—this had served its use. He had already given Mary, the mother, to John; she truly was blessed among women, but as mother, not of God, as some still say, but of the Son of man, a holy thing in truth, but her part had been temporary, for he had become her Lord and God, as he is ours.

The above is an outline of Swedenborg's teaching concerning the Lord, the Redeemer. There are some details that may now follow, which cover aspects that should be considered.

It is said by some that Joseph was father to Jesus, by others also that Mary was overshadowed sufficiently—so that her child was better than the usual Jewish boy; both views failing to acknowledge a distinctly miraculous event.

One of Swedenborg's more important assertions is that all life is from the Lord, that we are recipients, not sparks separate; and that in generation, the male provides the inner of the reactive elements, which we may here call the soul, and that the female provides the body or receptive part. He held this to be true generally, from the plant seeds, which are in function masculine, through the animal kingdom up to man.

He says concerning the Lord Jesus Christ that through the heredity from the mother he was in touch with the sin of the world, felt its influences, and was enabled to overcome them.

When the thought of the Incarnation is suggested as being that of God—and not as of one third, or a part of God, as is usually held—objection is sometimes made that God could not look after his universe when he was cooped up in a man in Palestine.

There is no need, when one thinks of Incarnation, to trouble thus, for what was happening was the attempt by the Divine Being to enlarge and deepen his grip on his universe; for Incarnation is the getting into touch with the stray sheep, or is the forgiving of the prodigal, and neither shepherd nor the prodigal's father suffers limitation in the care for wandering sheep or son. Their office is enlarged.

In conclusion, a few lines from one of Swedenborg's posthumous works may be appropriate.

In Jesus Christ, the Divine from eternity and the human in time are united as soul and body in man.

Union was and is reciprocal, and thus full.

Consequently God and Man, that is, the Divine and the human, are one Person.

All the Divine things of the Father are at the same time in the human of the Lord.

Thus the Lord is the one and only God, who had all power in the heavens and on the earths from eternity, and will have to eternity.

He is "the First and the Last," the "Beginning and the End," "who was, who is, and who is to come," "the Alpha and the Omega," "the Almighty."

He is "the Father of eternity," "Jehovah our Justice," "Jehovah the Saviour and Redeemer," "Jehovah Lebaoth."

They who go to him, as Jehovah and as the Father, and are united to him, become his sons, and are called "the sons of God."

These are receptacles of his Divine human (Canons, Chapter X).

[EDITORIAL NOTE.—This article will perhaps interest many of our readers as a Swedenborgian view of the Person of Christ. There have been a few prominent Methodists who have also held this view of the absolute personal unity of the Eternal God with Jesus Christ, but not many, and perhaps none at present. There is one slight historical error in this article. The Arians and semi-Arians, somewhat incorrectly titled Modernists, are said to have denied the Divine birth of Jesus. Not so, they allowed his preexistence—but did not admit its eternal character, and they also accepted as have practically all branches of Christians, until very recently, the supernatural character of his human birth. And Athanasius was hardly a Fundamentalist in the present sense in which that word is used. The Nicene Creed was really a compromise. Of course this matter does not seriously affect Mr. Billings' argument.]

THE EXISTENCE OF THE SOUL

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE COSTIN

Relay, Maryland

IF the physical produces the psychical, then it follows that with the dissolution of the former the latter ceases to exist. Whether the physical is conceived to be the body with the brain as its thinking organ or the material universe with all that it contains of mentality, when matter is dissolved then all psychical phenomena disappear. That is, taking the view that the physical produces the psychical—which is materialism—at death man's existence psychically and spiritually ceases and nothing remains but a dead disintegrating body. Materialism as the philosophy of man's being deals a death blow to the existence of the soul and the immortality of man's spiritual being as a psychical entity. Materialism does not deny the spiritual as the product of the living physical organism, but rather accepts all mental phenomena as fact upon the basis of matter and motion or the grouping of the physical elements, affirming, however, the nonexistence of the psychical agent or self. Of course if the physical has the power to produce all psychical and spiritual phenomena, then, the mind or soul as a spiritual entity would be a superfluity. What would be the use of a unitary mind or self if all mental products result from the physical organism and not from the mind itself? In that case there need be no connection or concomitance established between the physical and the soul. It is only proper to conclude, therefore, that if the brain does the thinking and produces all the other spiritual activities, there is no soul or psychical self.

Materialism undertakes a difficult task when it attempts to account for all psychical and spiritual phenomena on the basis of the physical without postulating the soul. By the soul we mean that unitary spiritual agent, thought as inclusive of all other terms used to express mental phases of the conscious self, such as the mind—the intellectual activity of the soul—the spirit, or the Godward phase of spiritual activity, the self, as conscious and self-

conscious, and the mental subject, as the ground of psychical elements and processes. The term soul is traditional and scriptural as well as philosophical. Jesus used the term when he spoke of the possibility of one's "losing his own soul." Materialism's difficult task, we repeat, is, in the face of critical thought, to successively account for all spirituality—mental, moral, emotional, volitional, æsthetic, ideal and religious—upon the basis of the physical—the brain merely—without the unitary self-conscious personal soul. If critical thought accepts materialism as true then faith is put in a corner unless we simply believe in the existence of the soul in the face of all materialistic rationalism. In most cases anyway the soul is held by faith with little or no effort to rationalize it, which is perfectly right as to the use of belief but unsound as to the use of reason. Faith as a gift is intended to bridge us over where we cannot see—we walk by faith. At the same time we are to cultivate a living insight—we are to seek to rationalize as rapidly as possible the things held by faith. Ratiocination is not inconsistent with faith. We come now to ask is there any way out? Does critical thought side with materialism? Has man a soul or not? Or rather is man a soul, a spirit-being? Or is he a brain, a physical being merely? The only procedure in sound reason is to determine by critical thought which philosophy the more adequately meets the demands of all the facts, materialism or spiritualism—that is, the brain alone without the aid of the soul—denying its existence—or the soul as a spiritual unitary agent in connection with the brain.

Materialism and spiritualism both reduce the material world to matter and motion. Spiritualism is careful not to include mind in the material world, whereas materialism does include it. The brain, then, as physical, which for materialism produces the mental, is matter and motion—matter as mass compounded of molecules, and they in turn made up of atoms, and atoms of electrons, all in action. The brain is matter in motion, is a vibrating physical organism. If thought is produced by the brain it must be by the grouping of the physical elements; that is to say, a certain combination of molecules is a particular thought, a definite grouping of atoms is an idea. But who ever dreamed that thought is

matter in motion! In that case, under a strong glass, thought should be visible to the human eye, whereas the mental eye alone beholds ideas and sees the mind's products. So that to say that any combination or grouping of the physical elements is thought is absurd. But it is affirmed that while the physical grouping of the elements is not thought the brain has the power to produce thought in the sense of secreting it; the brain is a thinking gland. In all glandular processes the secretion is like unto the essence of the gland itself; in that case thought again would be physical and could be seen under the microscope, which is absurd. To say that thought is something that is thrown off by the brain, not as a secretion but as a creation, is to make the brain a creative agent and thus to postulate it as a soul; otherwise as a purely physical organ it is compelled to produce after its kind; and since thought is not physical but psychical it must be created not by the brain but by a psychic agent. Nor is it sufficient to formulate a new theory of the physical in order to save materialism; besides it is a dangerous procedure; the present conception of the physical as matter and motion is the result of the intellectual labor of the centuries, and has, because of its clearness and simplicity, brought science to its present stage of productiveness. To modify matter by combining it with mind, thus giving us a more refined matter, is suicidal to science. There is a vast difference between saying that mind—absolute mind—affects all atoms of matter and affirming that mind is matter or is blended by natural structural and constitutional causes with matter. The new matter is like the blending of H_2O in the production of a new element, water. Matter and mind put together—blended—become a new kind of matter, a "matter-mind" element, so to speak, which is neither matter nor mind but a monistic element resulting from the blending of the two. Monism as a theory of matter destroys both mind and matter, and as having the power to produce thought—for which purpose the theory is invented—fails miserably; for the thought produced is not mental or psychic thought but physical thought; it is matter infected by thought and thought tainted by matter, which is nonsense. It is better to let matter remain as real matter and yield after its kind, namely, material products, and mind

remain real mind yielding its kind, namely, the psychic life. To place mind by the side of matter is no help to materialism, for mind thus posited to mean anything would have to be a psychic entity or agent which would do the thinking and not the matter by its side, and that entity or agent is what we mean by the soul. We conclude, then, on the counts thus far that materialism is an absolute failure. We now pass to another phase of the subject.

Descartes through doubt or denial reduced the ultimate principle to thinking; his *cogito ergo sum*—I think, that is to say, I am—is a notion that favors spiritualism. The word *cogito* means not merely thinking, but, I think. Pure thinking is an impossible conception, just as pure activity is a perfectly absurd notion. While Descartes always found thinking remaining even after the denial of thinking itself, for the process of denial and doubt was thinking—so that to deny thinking was to think—yet it was not thinking in the void, a sort of spontaneous effect without a cause, nor was it divine or cosmic, but human thinking. He began with his own doubts and ended with I think—*cogito*—and not merely thinking. Thinking must have a thinker, and that thinker is in *cogito*. It is the “I” of *cogito*, of I think. The thinker, the “I,” is not only human but conscious and self-conscious; doubting is deliberate; the thinker in doubting reveals himself to be a self-conscious thinking person. Is the brain a self-conscious thinking person? Or is the soul that person? By consciousness is meant the soul’s awareness of its mental content, by self-consciousness, the soul’s awareness of itself. Consciousness as awareness is a unitary grasp of all the elements of the mental life; to realize that activity there must be postulated a unitary agent; the brain is not unitary but divisible and, therefore, powerless in doing anything unitary. The brain is neither conscious nor self-conscious; it cannot be aware of itself or its content by the grasp of any unitary activity or agent, for it itself is not a unit, and has no power of unitary action within itself. All the psychical processes and elements require a personal self-conscious agent as their adequate cause. Cognition, feeling and will are impossible as merely physical products; they spring from psychical unity, and the brain is neither psychical nor a unit. Everything favors the out and out

existence of the soul or spiritualism; materialism is wholly inadequate.

Immanuel Kant in his deduction of the categories and of the principles of intuition made clear the apriority of pure reason. A principle of the reason is apriori when universal and necessary; space, for example, as an activity of the intuitive faculty, is the objectifying power by which the mind gives form to the objects of experience, projects and relates them. Space is not produced by or infected by objects; neither does it affect them; space is that activity of the mind by which the world of objects gets the meaning of spreadoutness; it makes experience and knowledge possible. Space is a constitutional activity belonging to the structural nature of the mind as an endowment at its creation; it is universal in that wherever objects are thought to exist the mind puts them in space, and a necessary activity since all minds are compelled to think in spacial terms. Is it not impossible to think of the brain as the seat of the spacial activity? Space is a unifying principle and requires a unitary agent as its source. The brain is not a unit, but the psychical self or soul is; thus the need of the soul. Time is that activity by which the mind gives form to events in both the objective and subjective world. It makes possible succession, and with the aid of memory constitutes the past. Time, like space, is one of nature's endowments; it is universal and necessary and, therefore, apriori. It too requires a unitary agent as its source; thus again we see the need of the soul. Kant deduced twelve categories and showed their apriori nature as universal and necessary conceptions of the understanding; he thus affirmed the need of the soul. Kant's transcendental ego—the source of all apriori activities—is the soul.

In dreams the constitutive activities are at work. Does the brain create dreams or the soul? Again the answer favors the latter. There are certain unifying activities at work in dreams. The dream world is given unity by the dream consciousness. Objects are created, individuated and given identity and relationship. Dreams are projected in a mental space and occur in mental time; motion, distance, location, and direction are added psychic meanings. A physical organ such as the brain, made up of component

parts, and therefore divisible, is helpless in providing the unifying activities necessary for the dream construction; nothing but a psychic self, a unitary psychic agent, will suffice. The mind in constructing its real world uses the activities at work in dreams; whatever the essence of the real world may be, in order to have significance it must be mentally constituted. Constitutivity calls into service the energizing activities of a unitary self or soul. The brain is powerless in reacting constructively upon external action; the soul alone can construct. We wish now to consider the sensational phase of the subject.

The view that the brain produces sensations and that the mind is merely the grouping of those sensations, and has no significance apart from them, is a false one. Sensational psychology is the complement of materialistic philosophy. Sensationalism fails in its understanding of psycho-physical parallelism and should be exposed. The brain is not the seat of sensations, it is merely a vibrating organ. A vibration is not a sensation. Nothing psychical can possibly lodge in the brain, come out of it, be secreted by it, flung from it, or created by it. The brain vibrates, but does not think. A sensation is to thought what an atom is to matter; it is the primary unit of mental content; it is psychically constituted and given unity and identity not by the brain but by the mind. That part of the mind where sensations are created is the sensibility. We may draw a light line parallel with the curve of the brain but not touching it to represent the region of the mind where sensations are formed, namely, the sensibility. We may draw below it a heavy line parallel with the first but not touching it to represent the region where vibrations occur, namely, the brain. All above the light line is the psychical, the soul; all below the heavy line is the physical, the brain. No physical element can possibly pass into the psychical sphere, and nothing psychical can get into the brain. The parallelism of the two lines symbolizes the psycho-physical parallelism of the two spheres. While the lines do not touch there is nevertheless a corresponding parallel play of influences between the two. The influences are psychical and physical; thus the notion of a psycho-physical parallelism of regions and influences. The way the system works is manifest; a certain vibration of the brain

will always summon into action the energizing of the sensibility, with the result that a certain sensation is constituted. The recurring of the previous vibration will occasion the re-creation of the previous sensation. And those activities will always occur together. For instance, a certain physical vibration V will always be accompanied by a certain psychical sensation S . V^1 will always be accompanied by S^1 ; V^2 by S^2 ; V^3 by S^3 ; V^4 by S^4 , etc. The reverse is also true; a certain volition from within the psychical sphere directed outward will occasion a certain physical effect as if energy had passed into the nervous system. The corresponding happenings within the two regions are sufficiently regular to justify the formulation of the psycho-physical parallel laws.

That a sensation is not in the brain is evident. Take for instance a sound. Is a vibration in the brain a sound? A sound is something we hear; can a vibrating physical organ hear? No. Its business is simply to vibrate; the mind does the hearing. Sound is mentally constituted; the same is true of taste, smell, sight, touch—all are given mental reality through the creative power of the sensibility. The mind does not will to have sensations; they are the product of a reason both immanent and spontaneous. The bell strikes and the sound as a sensation occurs or not in proportion as the sensibility is summoned by the vibrating brain to the creative act of intuitively constituting it as a primary psychical element. Sensibility is the sense side of the soul, the side where the vibrations from the senses to the brain come through an intuitive act of a psychic soul-agent to have representation in the form of the basic psychical elements we call sensations. While sensations are mental ultimates and entirely primary, they, at the same time, are the products of immanent reason, and as such are given existential being and unity not by the divisible physical organ the brain, but by the unitary psychical agent the soul. The unity and psychical nature of sensations make impossible their existence as the work of the brain; therefore, since they do exist it is necessary to postulate a psychical agent—the soul—as their source. Thus, instead of sensations grouped in whatever way found being the mind and all the mind there is they themselves are the product of the mind or soul. Besides sensations know nothing of each other and can do

nothing for themselves or for one another; they cannot group or associate themselves or combine in any possible way. Whatever associations or groupings are formed the mind does it. Associational psychology is a failure so far as accounting for the mental life is concerned, except as the mind itself associates and combines its sensations into the conceptions of the understanding. Sensations are simply the raw material of reason constituted at the sense or basic side of the mind, in themselves incapable of doing anything, but there ready for whatever intellectual use the mind may choose to put them to through the formative activities of the constitutional categories of the understanding. Sensations have no psychical or mental significance until consciousness is aware of them. The fact is the mind's awareness of sensations is coetaneous with their rise into being. Consciousness does not bring them into mental being—the mind does that at the point of its sensibility—but they have no existence either in the mind, below it, or outside of it, if consciousness is not aware of their presence. There are no subconscious sensations. There may be physical vibrations not sufficiently strong to summon the sensibility to create sensations but those vibrations are not themselves sensations. Sensations cannot occur except as the sensibility creates them; with their creation the mind becomes aware of them, and that awareness is consciousness. If they are not within the grasp of consciousness they do not exist anywhere.

The greatest fact apart from God is the soul. Great minds have denied the existence of all being except God and souls. If the existence of souls is denied then all that is left is God, or if matter exists and souls do not then all that exists is God and matter. And for some even God is an embarrassment; to deny his existence would reduce existence to matter. If matter is denied, then, nothing is but the thinking involved in denial. But thinking must have a thinker. The truth is that the thinker, the soul, exists—all souls exist—matter exists and God is.

AGNOSTICISM

WILLIAM K. ANDERSON

Butler, Pa.

MOST words are as ignorant of their parentage as Topsy of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* fame. But here we have one word which can proudly exhibit its coat of arms on the etymological hallway of history. Thomas Huxley is the proud parent of the word "Agnosticism." Or shall we say that he was the foster parent who christened the child of a predecessor—according to some, a very old child, whose real father must be sought back among the early Greeks—one Protagoras by name!

The story of the naming has some interest for us. Huxley tells it himself as follows (*Col. Essays*, Vol. 5, pp. 239-240):

When I reached intellectual maturity and began to ask myself whether I was an atheist, a theist or a pantheist, a materialist or an idealist; a Christian or a freethinker; I found that the more I learned and reflected, the less ready was the answer; until at last I came to the conclusion that I had neither art nor part with any of these denominations but the last. The one thing in which most of these good people were agreed was the one thing in which I differed from them. They were quite sure they had attained a certain "gnosis"—had more or less successfully solved the problem of existence; while I was quite sure I had not and had a pretty strong conviction that the problem was insoluble. And with Hume and Kant on my side, I could not think myself presumptuous in holding fast by that opinion. This was my situation when I had the good fortune to find a place among the members of that remarkable confraternity of antagonists, long since deceased but of green and pious memory, the Metaphysical Society. Every variety of philosophical and theological opinion was represented there. I felt like the historical fox when, after leaving the trap in which his tail remained, he presented himself to his normally elongated companions. So I took thought and invented . . . the appropriate title of Agnostic. It came into my head as suggestively antithetic to the "gnostic" of the Christian Church, who professed to know so much about the very things of which I was ignorant.

But, as I have already stated, this philosophical baby was in the world long before it was named and adopted by the great Englishman of the nineteenth century. Jacob Gould Schurman in his

little monograph on Agnosticism and Religion speaks of Agnosticism as being always present, or waiting in the offing, as a "challenge to philosophy to frame a rational theory of knowledge and spiritual notion of God."

Just as one can find a trace of empiricism in English philosophy from Roger Bacon on—an empiricism that finally came to complete expression in John Locke—so one can find the agnostic attitude, nascent in nearly all, if not all, of the earlier English philosophers, coming to full life with Hume, nurtured and named by Huxley and matured under the influence of Herbert Spencer.

Let us stand off and watch a few of the indications of this development. We see Berkeley, following Locke, rescuing spiritual values, or at least attempting to, from the dangerous assaults of Locke's empiricism. But he did more than he had anticipated, in paving the way for Hume, who accepted his denial of the possibility of knowing matter, and applied the same denial to spirit. Three quotations from Hume's works will serve to show the extent to which he carried his inexorable logic:

The idea of a substance as well as that of a mode is nothing but a collection of simple ideas that are united by the imagination, and have a particular name assigned to them by which we are able to recall, either to ourselves or to others, that collection (Vol. 1, p. 31f.). Again,

The opinion of external existence, if rested on natural instinct, is contrary to reason, and if referred to reason, is contrary to natural instinct, and carries no natural evidence with it to convince an impartial inquirer (Vol. 4, p. 177). Again,

What we call a mind is nothing but a heap or collection of different perceptions, united together by certain relations, and supposed, though falsely, to be endowed with perfect simplicity and identity (Vol. 1, p. 260).

When he adds to this his denial of any inherent necessity in the connection of cause and effect his Agnosticism becomes complete and he may well lay claim to be the first to express as his philosophy of life the oft quoted statement, "Life is just one damn thing after another." With Hume that intellectual position becomes a logical necessity.

Turning for a moment to the Continent, we find the Agnostic attitude dealt with in France by the positivists and in Germany by Kant. The Agnostic attitude of the former is illustrated in an

incident which happened between Napoleon and La Place. "M. La Place," said Napoleon, "they tell me you have written this large book on the system of the universe and have never even mentioned its Creator." Whereupon La Place drew himself up and answered bluntly: "Sire, I had no need of any such hypothesis."

Kant, while setting out to answer Hume, has nevertheless been consistently accused of belonging to this same Agnostic school, the root of the accusation being in his distinction between the *Ding an sich* and the thing as we know it. The knowledge of *the thing as it is* is impossible to us, says Kant, because this is always qualified by the forms (knowledge of thinking of the human mind). While he thus lost a knowledge of material reality as it is, he did thereby save the identity of the mind, which was in danger as a result of the attacks of Hume. "Kant has shown . . . that the connective principles, by which the contents of consciousness are combined, in an intelligible, rational unity, belong of necessity to the mind itself . . . and are not casual results of but necessary conditions for any experience" (Garvie, *Encyc. Rel. and Ethics*).

Coming back to Britain we find another Christian apologist carrying on the Agnostic school, Sir William Hamilton, who, pinning his faith on the appeal to faith, concedes practically everything that Agnosticism stood for, and was used with suave courtesy and telling roughness by Huxley and Spencer, even as Berkeley had been similarly used by Hume.

And now we may allow foster father Huxley to hold the baby for a few moments. And this is the baptismal ceremony:

For what, after all, do we know of this terrible matter, except as a name for the unknown and hypothetical cause of states of our own consciousness? And what do we know of that "spirit" over whose threatened extinction by matter a great lamentation is arising . . . except that it also is a name for an unknown and hypothetical cause, or condition, of states of Consciousness? Again (*Col. Es.*, Vol. 1, p. 554): It is in itself of little moment whether we express the phenomena of matter in terms of spirit, or the phenomena of spirit in terms of matter—each statement has a certain relative truth. But with a view to the progress of science, the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred. For it connects thought with the other phenomena of the universe, . . . whereas the alternative, or spiritualistic, terminology is utterly barren, and leads to nothing but obscurity and confusion of ideas. Thus there can be little doubt that the further science advances, the more extensively and con-

sistently will all the phenomena of nature be represented by materialistic formulæ and symbols.

The gist of this is summed up in a sentence from a professor of mine in a large university, some years ago. The interview had to do with the classification of news matter in a religious journal, a former student having made the categories and done the classification. All went well until he came to a classification called "The Spiritual Life." The professorial brain was puzzled and gave expression to its bewilderment by stating, "The Spiritual Life! I don't know what the devil he means by that." So Huxley! if correctly judged by the quotations given.

Huxley was a great old warrior, and was never so happy as when in battle. He writes Darwin, after hastily going over the *Origin of Species*:

I trust you will not allow yourself to be in any way disgusted or annoyed by the considerable abuse . . . which is in store for you. . . . Some of your friends are endowed with an amount of combativeness which . . . may stand you in good stead. I am sharpening up my claws and beak in readiness.

With reference to the validity of his anti-Christian arguments, it must in justice be stated that they are much less potent in our day than they were in his own time, for he seemed to share the view of his generation that all religious values hinged on the truth of the miraculous element and that, if it were once admitted, for instance, that the swine of Gadera were not literally bedeviled in their wild rush to the sea, no one could longer admit the value of the life and teaching of Jesus. As Schurman says, "It is humiliating to think that the wretched pigs of Gadera may make or unmake our religious faith."

Turning now to Huxley's contemporary, Herbert Spencer, we find in him a systematic philosophy of Agnosticism. This is developed in Part I of *First Principles*, which deals with "The Unknowable." Approaching the question by way of an examination of the origin of the universe, he says that there are three "intelligible suppositions"—that it is (1) self-existent, (2) self-created, or (3) created by an external agency. All of these he rejects as "literally unthinkable."

It is not a question of probability, or credulity, but of conceiva-

bility. Experiment proves that the elements of these hypotheses cannot even be put together in consciousness; and we can entertain them only as we entertain such pseudo-ideas as a square fluid and a moral substance—only by abstaining from the endeavor to render them into actual thoughts (*First Princ.*, p. 29).

So the atheistic, the pantheistic and the theistic views of the universe are all examined, found to be impossible and thrown into the discard.

"If religion and science are to be reconciled, the basis of the reconciliation must be this deepest, widest, and most certain of all facts—that the Power which the Universe manifests to us is inscrutable." He reasons that there must be a First Cause and that it must be Absolute, but it is beyond the reach of knowledge and the only theory corresponding to the necessities of the case, and giving the soul peace of mind, is his own theory of Agnosticism. It is this, he claims, which reconciles Religion and Science.

Common Sense asserts the existence of a reality; Objective Science proves that this reality cannot be what we think it; Subjective Science shows why we cannot think of it as it is, and yet are compelled to think of it as existing; and in this assertion of a Reality utterly inscrutable in nature, Religion finds an assertion essentially coinciding with her own (*First Princ.*, p. 84).

Here then we find ourselves at the end of the Agnostic road. And the end proves to be an insuperable stone wall on which we may bark our shins and tear our hands and beat our heads. And on the wall a sign, autographed by Herbert Spencer himself, and reading, "In its ultimate nature nothing can be known" (page 56).

No one has gone beyond Spencer in the statement of the Agnostic philosophy. It is difficult to see how that were possible. When a man reaches the North Pole he is there. Others may follow, but none can go beyond him. We leave him, for the moment then, camped out on the ice, where all is bleak, and barren and deathly cold, enjoying life most in the winter solstice, when there is no sun to disturb the doped slumbers of his Agnostic mind. He tells this mind that there is nothing in the world for it to know, and in the perpetual darkness of the wintry season he can best believe it.

There remains for us, perhaps, the privilege of criticism. In launching out on this, may we not first draw a legitimate distinc-

tion between Agnosticism as a systematized philosophy and as an attitude of mind? Someone has said that everyone is as agnostic as he dares to be—a statement which has much truth in it. The temper of the age is agnostic to the extent of wanting to “prove all things” at the bar of reason, and rejecting what is palpably irrational. With that type of Agnosticism, no one, trained in the thinking of the modern world, will find fault.

But I make bold to say that Agnosticism as a satisfactory philosophy is an anomaly. For philosophy by the very derivation of its name loves knowledge, and the Agnostic says there “ain’t no such animal”; philosophy seeks ultimates, while Agnosticism blocks the path, turning traitor to her own family. Science has to do with the description of phenomena, and always, when true to its own nature, holds itself aloof from speculation regarding ultimates; philosophy has to do with noumena, and when it denies all knowledge of them or possibility of knowing them, it has destroyed philosophy itself.

Agnosticism not only destroys itself as a philosophy, but in the very act of proving itself as true, denies its own nature, which requires that it know nothing. To quote Doctor Ladd on this point (*Knowledge, Life and Reality*, Chap. 7): “If the agnostic, with reference to the fundamental beliefs and reasoned conclusions of this larger experience, avows not only the maxim ‘I-do-not-know,’ but also ‘you-do-not-know,’ and ‘nobody-knows, or ever will know, or from the nature of things can know,’ then he is no longer agnostic, but has become the most conceited and irrational of dogmatists.” If he is to be true to his own faith and not destroy it in the very act of building it up, he must be content to be a “Knowing-nothing,” and that is a hard thing for any Agnostic to do.

Another difficulty that haunts the Agnostic is the fact that in demonstrating his thesis, he is actually denying its truth. How can it be that his own intricate arguments can be promulgated without betraying the mind that is their author? As Schurman has said (*Agn. and Rel.*, p. 92): “The Agnostic, in laying down the limits of Knowledge, is a champion of the might of mind. That he can make such a demonstration is the refutation of what he demonstrates.”

I have spoken of science, of how it has to do with phenomena, and when confined to its proper field stays in the phenomenal world, leaving the interpretation of its facts to philosophy. Science itself, then, can never be truly agnostic. For instance, "Darwinism assumed no causes but such as could be proved to be actually at work"—that is, the phenomenal causes. It needed nothing more. It was a purely scientific question and it rightly left interpretations to others, which interpretations have been made.

But sometimes we have the spectacle of a science jumping the fence and leaving its own field for the field of interpretation of ultimates. When it does so, it ceases to be a science and must cease to expect the immunity from criticism which it, as a science, enjoys. Such an attitude is rather prevalent in the behavioristic school of psychologists. Psychology studies the facts of mind and classifies its knowledge. It may rightly assume, for the sake of study, that the mind is only a "stream of consciousness" and may be interested only in its manifestations, for that is its field. But sometimes it says with Hume that "mind is nothing but a heap or collection of different perceptions supposed falsely to be endowed with identity." One may do this if he likes, but he must recognize that when he does so he ceases to be a psychologist and becomes a philosopher, for he is dealing with ultimate interpretations.

An illustration of this comes from the university class room. The incident had to do with the definition of "conscience," which was defined as the "habits of thinking and feeling in connection with a moral situation." Conscience may be so defined, but may I express the opinion that the Agnosticism here represented is not that of psychology but of philosophy? It has not the necessary accuracy of scientific investigation, but the possible fallibility of all ultimate judgments. May I quote Huxley to support my view?

Cosmic evolution may teach us how the good and the evil tendencies of man may have come about; but, in itself, it is incompetent to furnish any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before.—*Col. Es.: Evol. and Ethics*, p. 80.

Nor does psychology give us the "why" for the preference of good over evil and is therefore, in itself, incompetent to define conscience. When conscience is defined as above, it cannot boast that

it is the agnosticism of science. It is the agnosticism of philosophy, and as such is open to the criticisms of philosophical Agnosticism.

Finally, Agnosticism is unsatisfactory as a philosophical resting place because the Agnostics themselves, with the possible exception of Spencer, were unable to be consistent in their boasted philosophy of denials. We have the spectacle of Hume going perhaps beyond the rank and file of educated Christians to-day in the acceptance of miracle; we have Huxley stating to Wilfred Ward in 1894 that he holds to the argument from design and adding that "Faulty as is the Christian definition of Theism, it is nearer the truth than the creed of some agnostics who conceive of no unifying principle in the world."

The North Pole may be a good place to visit, but as Amundsen would testify, it is not a comfortable place to live. Agnosticism will always be with us as a salutary influence, but it can never become the permanent philosophy of the human race. Science may do its best. There is still room for a constructive, non-agnostic, philosophical and religious interpretation of those facts. So science on the one hand and philosophy and religion on the other both have their legitimate fields—the one the investigation and classification of facts; the other, the interpretation of these same facts. And they are to a marked degree parallel in their working. Science posits its hypotheses and confirms or rejects them as tested to be true or false on the basis of experience; religion follows the same testing principle, not with reference to phenomena, but with reference to the ultimates—God and the spiritual nature of man.

Both know only phenomena. Both assume a reality behind these appearances. If science can fold its hands and refuse to play ball unless allowed to assume the unproved and unprovable theory of the constancy of energy in the universe, in the interests of satisfying mental demands, religion has an equally undeniable right to find ultimates in the spiritual realm, thereby satisfying the demands of men's souls. This privilege must be extended to her so long as she, in turn, constantly checks herself up by the findings of science and aims to formulate a view of the world able to defend itself at the bar of reason.

OTHER SHEEP

JOHN LEONARD COLE

Bennington, Vt.

ARCHAEOLOGISTS who dig up skulls, bones and embalmed bodies show uncanny certitude in locating the period of human history to which their unearthed skulls, bones and mummies belong. So well have they charted the long voyage of human minds and bodies and so well do they know the marks of each stage that they catalogue things "paleozoic," "1800 B. C.," "12th dynasty of Ptolemies," with calm finality.

But no excavator or antiquarian coming across the following sentence and knowing that it was spoken in sincere accents, would locate it around the time of 30 A. D., and in the city of Jerusalem: "I have other sheep too that do not belong to this fold. I must lead them too, and they will obey my voice and they will all become one flock, with one shepherd." To any student of Palestinian affairs in the first century it would seem positively incredible that such a sentence could emanate from the very hotbed of racial and religious exclusiveness and that it should come, above all, from the lips of a Jew himself. These sons of Abraham fervently believed themselves to be the very lords of creation, a very singular and peculiarly chosen people. The Prussian's pride in his Kultur and his strong feeling of obligation to spread the same, even though by force, throughout the earth, was mild compared with the first-century Hebrews' haughtiness of race and destiny. Their most religious type, the Pharisee, thanked God every morning that he was not born a slave, a woman or a Gentile. Outside the true flock of David, and beyond the exclusive family of the circumcised children of Abraham, were only "dogs," "Samaritans," "heathen." Whatever temporary political ascendancy the Gentile dogs might enjoy—particularly the Romans—it was but for a time; the future lay with the Jews.

You would as soon expect a lily to grow in an ash heap as a

sentence like this "other sheep" one to come from the midst of such a people and from the lips of a true child of Abraham, a son of the house of David. If there is anything which reveals Jesus' amazing superiority to his contemporaries, compels us to reject the classification of him as a "first-century Jew," and drives us to call him timeless and universal, it is a sentence from his lips of such big-hearted tolerance as this, while everyone around him was speaking words of bigoted intolerance.

Rousseau, comparing him with Socrates, thought it was his death which declared him to be "a god," and not a sage. Goethe thought that it was the "splendor of a sublimity that must have been divine shining forth in the person of Jesus" which marked him as beyond cataloguing with ordinary men. And Napoleon, who, despite his supreme egotism, will have to be credited with ability to recognize superiority, declared, "Everything in Jesus amazes me."

But beyond his heroic death, and this radiance of personality, and the general amazing quality of his "gospel, empire, and progress through all centuries," is this most unlooked for spirit of universality—this magnanimity toward, aye, yearning over, all peoples of the earth—his claiming them as "his," fit for recognition and worthy of cooperation in the ultimate family of the nations ("one fold"). The ability to think in such terms, at such a time, and amid the provincial people who supplied him heredity and environment, is one of the surest signs that Jesus is neither a *first century Jew*, nor a *Jew*; he overleaps national boundaries, racial and temporal limitations. He is really cosmopolitan and ageless.

It is not only above his fellow citizens of Judea and Galilee that he towers. When he is measured on this scale of great-hearted love and earth-wide interest he makes the inhabitants of all lands and the people of all subsequent centuries appear like pigmies. He looms above our Anglo-Saxon professors laboring hard to prove a Nordic superiority, above our hooded figures searching out with their torches by night the "nigger" and the "sheeny," to administer either a good fright or summary "justice" (to teach them their place), above our indignant legislators rushing through exclusion

acts against the Japanese, above the wrangling theologians who discourse heatedly over matters delicate (but far from decisive) like the virgin birth. Above them all the figure of this wide-armed and broad-visioned Christ stands. He puts us all to shame, as much as he did the erect standing Pharisee who cast a disdainful glance toward an obscure corner of the temple where a tax collector beat his breast, while he prayed "*with himself*." Men called by his name through the centuries have engaged in such bloody bigotry that they do not deserve to stand near him: putting in the ranks such truth seekers as Galileo, burning up scholars like Huss and Tyndale, excommunicating sainted leaders like Joan of Arc, driving from their cathedrals cultured evangelists like Wesley, chasing from their settlements such saints as Roger Williams and hunting heresies in spiritual teachers like Gladden and Fosdick. Spite of twenty hundred years for this heaven of brotherly tolerance to reach the whole "lump" of human society, it has so far failed to affect our deep-lying prejudices that a professional visitor in a great city can tell this story: Finding a young Russian Jewess living in a quarter largely inhabited by Gentiles, desperately lonely and about to become a mother, the visitor advised her, in case of sudden need, to ask one of her neighbors to phone for help. "There isn't anyone to call," she answered. "All the people who live around here are Christians." To quote Glenn Frank, "It is one of the petty ironies of history that to-day the Ku Klux Klan is literally copying the Jews it hates in attempting to create a religio-racialism and doing it in the name of a Jew who denounced it."

There is nothing in the words or manner of this young Jewish leader from the hills of Nazareth who talked so calmly about giving up his life for his sheep, both his own and "other sheep," that would indicate any sense of superiority as he looked out toward the others—the non-Jewish. A feeling of perfect respect and equality marks what he says about Greek, Roman, bond or free. Pharisaic arrogance has no place in him; race or religion is of no consequence in his eyes. As he looked out over to Italy, Egypt, Asia Minor—there are other sheep; they are "not of this fold"; but they are "*his*." And they can become "one flock." The aver-

age haughty Pharisee regarding the members of these other races would have called them not sheep, but "goats," or "jackasses."

When his twentieth century adherents climb up to a spiritual elevation anywhere near Jesus there is no racial or religious superiority left. As incongruous as darkness out of a noonday sun, or cold out of blazing embers, is racial or religious arrogance in genuine Christians. That a black man is something little less than a white, or an Italian something lower than an American, that yellow is less beautiful a color than white—these conceptions simply do not go with Jesus' mind, and cannot mark any mind that is like his. One of the largest Protestant churches has declared in its greatest representative body, this fine sentiment: "We repudiate as unchristian and untrue the idea that certain races are born to inherent and fixed superiority and subordination. We stand for the life of open opportunity for all." But it was an agency of that same church which in conducting an inquiry into the actual feelings of its members toward other races learned that an overwhelming majority are strongly antagonistic to the Turk and that though there is a striking tolerance of the Jew, one contributor admitted he would not receive a Jew in his home unless he was a Christian, adding, "Christians should not recognize non-Christians as social equals." Sidney Gulick tells of a Japanese gentleman who had been repeatedly welcomed in a certain church by a deacon, but who, when he ventured to accost the same man on the street, was amazed to hear, "I am your friend in church, but not elsewhere." This indicates a racial equality and a brotherly love with very qualifying reservations.

Secretary J. B. Oldham of the International Missionary Council told an audience of Episcopalians in England last October that many of the leading Moslems of the Near East were inclined to throw their lot with the Bolsheviki solely because they treated them as equals while the Western nations did not. "Western" means "Christian" there and most everywhere, although Christian doesn't mean what the one it is derived from would have it, could he have his way. A governor of two residences in India, Lord Willingdon, says that the Easterners resent the idea of superiority assumed by the Westerner. "In my view there is only

one solution of the problem. The white races must realize the necessity of treating all colored men in the spirit of absolute equality and give up the attitude of color superiority." These keen-minded, spiritually sensitive natives of India, with their close affinity for the essence of Jesus' message, put their fingers straight upon the weak spot in much modern religion called Christianity. Shoran Singha, a Christian Indian, says to us, "We have got to get rid of the idea that God sent the white man to rule the black. We must get rid of the white man's prestige. Not the prestige of color, but the prestige of character will count in the future." It comes with something of a shock to our complacent ears to hear men of other faiths and races arraigning us for narrowness and intolerance. But it is wholesome nevertheless to get a glimpse of ourselves as others see us. In the *Islamic Review*, May, 1921, Professor Abdul Karim Kpakpa-Quartey writes:

"To-day in Christian America the God-created black man, notwithstanding his Christian affiliations, intelligence or social prominence, is a slave and a serf, perhaps worse than in the dramatic days of the world-famed *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. He or she is still liable to be brutally flogged, kicked, knocked, imprisoned, shot dead or lynched at the will and pleasure of the bloodthirsty and savage American Tin God. Can you imagine the striking contrast between Caucasian Christianity and Islam, the religion of humanity? So utterly preposterous and absurd and scientifically illogical is color prejudice that I will not waste time in controversy."

If we loyal Americans rather resent such vigorous charges we have only to recall in point of fact that part of a recent Sunday in Mississippi was spent by about a thousand citizens in tying a Negro to a post, drenching him with coal oil and congratulating themselves over the ashes on the celerity of justice in that community.

From a certain ex-emperor, stripped of everything except overweening egotism, there still sounds forth every little while from Doorn a high-sounding warning about the "yellow peril." But from the present occupant of the White House comes such a deprecation as ought to come from a democratically minded Vermont-reared Christian against any such assumption of racial or religious superiority, a protest against this idea of keeping certain groups "in their place." In the most praised speech he ever made,

and one which an influential weekly said ought to be sold by all postmasters at the cost of printing, Calvin Coolidge declared:

"Among some of the varying racial, religious, and social groups of our people there have been manifestations of an intolerance of opinion, a narrowness of outlook, a fixedness of judgment against which we may well be warned. . . . We are not likely to improve our own condition or help humanity very much until we come to the sympathetic understanding that human nature is about the same everywhere, that it is rather evenly distributed over the surface of the earth, and that we all are united in a common brotherhood. . . . There should be an intellectual demobilization as well as a military demobilization. . . . We shall only be entering a period of preparation for another war unless we can demobilize the racial antagonisms, fears, hatreds, and suspicions, and create an attitude of toleration in the public mind of the peoples of the earth."

That this people is not yet intellectually demobilized, or in any vital sense, in any Christly thoroughness, democraticized, is proved by the frequency and the venom with which such words as these are heard among the hundred percenters: "Nigger," "Sheeny," "Dago," "Yap," "Greaser," "Papist," "Red," "Bolshevist," "Atheist." The mental attitude back of such expressions and the columns of labored argument and warning by the self-constituted prophets of the several menaces to true Protestant Americanism ought to send us, every time we think of the quiet, clear-seeing Judean who hailed the earth's diversified millions as "my sheep," to the place of penitence, echoing Kipling's

"For frantic and foolish word,
Thy mercy on thy people, Lord."

As usual, the poets are nearer to the heart of the truth, and better interpreters of the spiritual teaching of Jesus, than the sociologists and theologians. Edwin Markham punctures all racial arrogance with the incisive truth:

"I care not what his temples or his creeds,
One thing holds firm and fast—
That into his fateful heap of days and deeds,
The soul of a man is cast."

What the Pharisees and the present-day alarmists among us seem to overlook is something that seemed to be very plain to this one, who jostled among the multitudes in city street and by the

sea shore years ago, namely, the inherent capacity of all kinds of folks to respond to the best and highest. In a certain mongrel race which a Jew pronounced with a hiss of hate, the Samaritan, Jesus perceived such a strain of nobility that he made one of them the hero in his most popular short story, called ever since "The Good Samaritan." In another "half breed," and a woman at that, he saw such alert mind and firm faith in God as made him say of it that it could not be equaled among all the sons of Abraham.

With such clear insight into men's hearts he said, concerning "the lesser breeds without the law," "They will hear my voice." Hard as the lesson is for many of us to learn, he declares that there is a spiritual responsiveness to God, an appreciation of the good, the true, the beautiful, in folks which we call "alien." Peter, a thoroughgoing, one hundred per cent Hebrew, trying hard to catch his Master's breadth of view, required a peculiar vision of a four-cornered sheet filled with all kinds of beasts therein, and an unforgettable sight in a Gentile's house reminiscent of a scene in Jerusalem where he and some other circumcised were recipients of the spirit of God, before he could acknowledge with an apparent reluctance, "Who was I that I could withstand God? . . . Then to Gentiles *also* has God granted repentance unto life." A sort of Q. E. D. which he can't avoid, but which he rather hates to admit, specially in the presence of several of the orthodox brethren of Jerusalem. Saul of Tarsus required a blinding vision near Damascus and years of meditation before he could agree that "To Gentile *also*, glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good." He had traveled a long way from Rabbi Gamaliel when he announced to the Athenians, "Of one blood hath he made every nation of the earth."

"I believe in man," was the declaration of one of America's greatest religious leaders, and title of his magazine article not long ago. It is not in the creed, but it is in the mind of him who "knew what was in man, and needed not that anyone tell him." He could steadily and expectantly declare, as he dropped his spoken gems of spiritual truth, "They *will* hear my voice." Most of us would have said, thinking of some whom he addressed, "Pearls before swine." But he insisted, "They will hear."

The life story of men in all climes and conditions confirms the high hope which this good Shepherd had for them and justifies his confidence in their innate power to appreciate and answer to his voice. Among Russia's millions there stands the Christ-spirited Tolstoi. Among India's Hindu masses stands Mahatma Ghandhi, "the greatest man in the world," according to Rabindranath Tagore. And there is C. R. Das, who died the other day in a little attic in Calcutta. Das had the largest law practice, worth \$50,000 a year, in the city of Calcutta and an estate which was one of the show places in the city. Hearing the call of Ghandhi, he gave up all to devote his wealth and talent to his India. He died poor, but loved by his countrymen, mayor of Calcutta, president of India's Swaraj Party, and leaving a sentence that sounds like an excerpt from the gospel: "Be it yours to offer yourselves as sacrifices in the interests of truth and justice, so that your children and your children's children may have the fruits of your suffering."

Even though "nations crowding to be born," may be exaggerated statement, enough in all races and lands have been "born," have heard and answered His voice, to prove the responsiveness of all kinds of "other sheep." It is demonstrated that there is no wandering, silly, stupid, deaf sheep anywhere from which it is futile to expect any response. "All God's chilluns got wings" is more than a catchy title; it connotes a big, caste-smashing fact of the human race. It suggests an underlying truth much needed by a generation of people who are "from Missouri" as far as concerns non-Nordics and non-Evangelicals. It is pretty good evidence (to modernize the figure) that broadcasting from station L-O-V-E is sure to be picked up by the delicate receiving set hidden in hearts beneath yellow, black, red and brown skins.

It is evident that the expectant Shepherd—with his Jewish background, but universal foreground—expects from these diverse flocks scattered everywhere, not only a passive hearing of his voice, but following that an act of participation in and a distinct contribution toward the good of the completed flock. It isn't a matter of just getting them in out of the cold, but the resulting combination within will be all the better for their presence. Not

that they will be standardized—God forbid! Not all run into the same orthodox mold, stamped “Made in U. S. A.” or “Safe and sane,” but that each will be all the richer for the others, the whole better for the parts. The authorized version to the contrary notwithstanding, it is not a common “fold” that will result or toward which he looks; it is one “flock,” a thing less wooden and artificial. It is a common life and outlook and leader which is to mark the consummation of the Shepherd’s effort, and not a single uniform inclosing structure. In just such manner, it is the consciousness and activity of a person, not uniformity, which comprises the unity of hands, eyes, mouth, among which there is, in a sense, no such thing as equality.

At the American Bar Association in Detroit, September, 1925, Charles Evans Hughes made these pertinent observations:

“Our institutions were not devised to bring about uniformity of opinion; if they had been we might as well abandon hope. . . . The essential character of true liberty is that under its sheltering many different types of life and character and opinion and belief can develop unmolested and unobstructed. Nowhere could this shelter be more necessary than in our own country, with its different racial stocks, variety of faiths, and the manifold interests and opinions which attest the vigor and zest of our intellectual life.”

There is a great deal of solemn warning heard these days about the failure of the melting pot to operate and of the distasteful ingredients that had been already allowed to get into the United States brew before we discovered that we had been deluded concerning “the land of the free and the home of the brave.” Still, no one wants to be too dogmatic with the assertion that Americanism would have been something a little healthier and holier if all the “alien” elements had been carefully excluded some hundred or so years ago. There *has* been an operation of some sort of alchemy that has got good from all strains, *far* East and near, *south* Europe and north; and has brought about a better product from all these diverse constituents. Among the heroes of the President Harding disaster in the fall of 1925 were names of such un-American aspect as Stedman, Brocco, Kane, Meyers, Carlson, Wiggle. Noting these, a great American weekly remarked, “Names that carry Teutonic, Latin, Scandinavian, and good Anglo-

Saxon sounds—American names. For to be an American is a matter of spirit, not of creed and blood." This is the old, yet ever rediscovered, secret of tolerance which a furious Pharisee named Saul had to learn by hard experience and deep meditation; "He is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but inwardly." Occasional emphasis anew on that big generous proposition is necessary in all lands where men tend to get bigoted—everywhere—if human beings continue to live together in this shrinking and explosive world. All can hear the call of the good, the pure, the beautiful, and all can, in God's good time, add something valuable to the total human response to it.

The means by which this idyllic dream of harmonious, commingled flocks is to come true is quite suggestive. What this time-defying Jew of the first century said was, "I must *lead* them too, and they will *obey* my voice, and they will all *become* one flock, with one shepherd." There is a sweet unearthly ease about it, a kind of non-violent or pacifist idea there which is most disconcerting to "practical" people. Disgusting it was to his contemporaries whose idea of unity and peace was to smite with a sword Jehovah's enemies;—a kind of a "Roman peace"—only it would be a *Jewish* peace with the true sons of Israel sitting in the thrones and exerting the power. The simplicity and the spirituality of the Shepherd's method of peace and unity seems just about as silly to many zealots to-day. Many bands of patriots stand organized and waiting to *compel* order and harmony in this distracted and divided world. Many eager seekers after oneness and peace have been ready to employ swords, guillotines, fagots, ropes, papal bulls, tar and feathers, and dogmas of damnation, to force erring and stubborn wanderers into the fold of orthodoxy and patriotism.

But straight athwart such methods of coercion is "I will lead, —they will obey." The way of spoken and incarnated truth, the appeal of the sacrificial life devoted to brotherhood, the way of being "lifted up"—as the Shepherd put it, this is the way to draw men together. Not the way of clubbing and anathematizing. Trust in spiritual methods seems very slow and unreliable to the average man of hard common sense to-day, the defenders of native-stock Americanism and blue-blood Protestantism. Still, a very

sagacious native Vermonter and deep-dyed Protestant said at the Omaha convention of the American Legion in October, 1925, "We cannot place our main reliance upon material forces. We must reaffirm our ancient faith in truth and justice and charitableness and tolerance. We must make our supreme commitment to the everlasting spiritual forces of life. We must mobilize the conscience of mankind."

The leader reared in the Vermont hills and the one brought up in the mountains of Galilee seem to shake hands across the centuries on what is, after all, humanity's final reliance in securing universal concord.

The other way—the reliance on intolerance, arrogance, rack and war—has been tried a plenty, weighed and found wanting. The dispersed sheep are still dispersed and our range in separate folds, and seem to be in danger of becoming more wolf like than mild in disposition. It is only sensible to try a while the way of the Good Shepherd: to trust and to teach, instead of suspect and drive. Whether you regard the United States of America, the United States of Europe or the United States of the world, we are "all in the same boat now," to quote President Coolidge again. And the boat seems to be getting cramped and dangerously tipped.

That spirit which prompted Ambassador Walter Page to write at the end of one of his books the following lines, must soon permeate mankind. It is their surest,—only,—hope:

"If any reader of that which I have written shall find anywhere a single word of bitterness I pray him to rub it out. For I have not meant to write such words. Sympathy for all, for all toleration; pity for many and for some affection; against ignorance and narrow mindedness, war to the end; but bitterness toward no human creature. Nor have I meant to complain, for complaint furthers no man on his way. If the world does not please us, the least we can do is to try with cheerfulness to make it more to our liking, and the harder the task, the more good will we need."

It is an old story which is told about the seaman's evangelist, Father Taylor; but it needs retelling here. When a Methodist minister refused to come on a platform with him because a Unitarian clergyman was already there, Taylor fell to his knees and prayed earnestly, "Oh Lord, deliver us here in Boston from bad rum and bigotry. Thou knowest O Lord which is worse."

The dilemma is still with us. Boston, New York, Chicago or San Francisco. The rum is probably more poisonous and the bigotry more dangerous. If General Andrews has trouble to protect us from the modern "bad rum," none the less has the Lord difficulty in saving us from our bigotry. But there is no other place to look than to him of the optimistic mind and the universal heart, the Shepherd of the "other sheep."

MOTHER'S DAY AT DREW

Hail, Alma Mater Drew, this Mother's Day!
God's yearly miracle—thy gray-green oaks
Whose strength and beauty now again He yokes—
From wintry sleep awakes to give us May,
Again thy loving hand upon us lay.
One of thy sons, who all love common folks,
Heaven's choicest blessings on thy head invokes.
Thy sons and daughters for thy welfare pray,
Upon thy sparkling crown the brightest jewel
Be evermore the human heart's renewal
By inbreathed Holy Spirit's vital power.
From famous forest, from historic manse,
From arching gateway as thy sons advance
Increase of Christ's own Life be e'er thy dower.
ALBERT OSBORNE.

American University, Washington, D. C.

THE HIGHEST ART

WENDELL M. THOMAS, JR.

Lahore, India

ART arises chiefly from play. With the development of conscious control, the sporadic outbursts of pent-up energy characterizing play are harnessed to drive the creative technique of art. Play is impulse using muscle. Art is imagination using mechanism. Art is acting, making, doing. It is the spontaneous expression of joy, valued not as a means to a further experience, but solely for its own sake. The thrill of joy comes from the freedom, ease and accuracy of self-expression; art's materials are responsive to art's desire. In *Human Traits* Irwin Edman tells us, "In the fine arts, to the imaginatively and technically endowed, the materials are prepared and controllable. . . . Language to the poet, for example, is an immediate and responsive instrument; he can mold it precisely to his ideal intention. . . . In music, even so simple an instrument as the flute can yield perfection of sound. The composer of a symphony can invent a perpetual uncorroded beauty; the sculptor an immortality of irrefutably persuasive form."

Art is creative because its materials lend themselves to creation. If experience as a whole were creative, if the universe were patently a work of art, if ordinary life were a song—how happy would be the lot of man! But life's materials are usually hard and obdurate, and often destructively antagonistic. Is it at all possible for life as a whole to become creative here and now, and if so, how? If life is to be creative, it must become *like art*. Just as in art imagination uses its simple tools on facile and limited materials, so in life imagination must use the whole complex of industry on the risky and unlimited materials of brute nature. This is the supreme artistic task of life. Is its achievement possible?

In the past, humanity as a rule has not even asked itself this question. It has tacitly assumed that the artistic delight of free control must be limited to a certain restricted supply of material and to a certain small class of society. High art was held to be

"fine" art; useful art with its vital struggle to win the means of livelihood was considered low. The "finer," easier and more abstract art became, the higher it was estimated, until the doctrine of "art for art's sake," divorcing it from industry and morality entirely, gave free rein to all sorts of petty, unbridled desires, resulting in the froth of exquisite decorative trifles, the idle stimulation of ingenious fluent melodies, and the subtle lure of sinuous sensations of form and color. Against this decadent art of the leisured classes, Tolstoi, the great Russian social prophet, led a fierce revolt in the name of art for the toiling masses. Rather than independent of morality, he declared, art should be the servant of morality. Rather than meticulous technique, art needs a social sympathy. Its work is simply to bind humanity together in one sentiment of fellow-feeling by symbolically exalting the homely experiences of common folk the world over, irrespective of national barriers. Such convictions are nicely expressed by E. A. Ross in *Social Control*.

"Art arouses the passions. . . . It supplies aids and symbols by which at gatherings and assemblies the individual is spurred to a common emotion. . . . Art kindles sympathy. . . . It gives that diffused pleasure that comes in moments of enlargement and solidarity. . . . The taproot of selfishness is weakness of the imagination. 'We can sympathize only with what we can picture to ourselves; and the inability to feel for another simply means the inability to grasp by the imagination the experiences through which the other is passing.' . . . We need to feel with those we shall never meet. We need a magic which shall lift into view what is below the horizon. The artist shows us in another sex, class, lot, group, race or age the old passions, longings, hopes, fears or sorrows we have so often supped and bedded with. So he calls forth fellow-feeling and knits anew the ever raveling social web."

But if art is merely hired out as servant to social morality, its intrinsic value, its free, spontaneous thrill of creation is ruined. What we want is an art both creative and social. The refined technique of "class" art is indeed the expression of creative impulse, but unsocial and hence limited to the narrow field of conventional "artistic" materials such as plaster and pigments, piano wire, writing materials and stage properties. The universal sympathy of "mass" art is social enough, but uncreative as far as its immediate work is concerned: it is devoted merely to the subordinate and

educational work of getting society to understand itself as a single unit of undivided interest, rather than to express itself in creative industrial achievement; and hence it too is limited to the conventional "artistic" materials it takes over uncritically from "class" art.

Technical art is "thesis"; social art is "antithesis"; the "synthesis" is yet to be. Technical art cannot free itself from the limits of the conventional easy materials until by its own excess it invites a reaction to social art. But social art cannot be truly spontaneous and creative until in turn it develops technical art to its utmost limit in the use of materials hard as well as easy, useful as well as "fine"—until, in short, art embraces industry as a whole, and not only unites, but also acts and makes. Now to expect the specific task of every worker to be an artistic craft is futile. The William Morris ideal of the artist worker is a beautiful and prophetic symbol of the desirable industrial life for *humanity*, but as a common individual practice it is probably impossible and likewise undesirable. Industry is not so: it is a vast and inter-related social enterprise whose virtue is to expand by machinery into great systems of cooperative specialization.

In common practice, not the individual but society must become the artist worker. To be sure, every person should be given sufficient opportunity and education to enjoy to some extent both the appreciation and the creation of conventional works of art; he must also share so fully in the life of the community that he regards his specialized industrial work as cheerful cooperation in the quick and efficient means of releasing the community for the enjoyment of play and conventional art. But this arrangement only touches the fringe of genuine art. The industrial machine itself must become a sensitive instrument in the hand of the artist *humanity*, a machine so flexible and finely adjusted, so controlled by the group that employs it, that under the inspiration of a corporate ideal the community can play with it somewhat as the artist of to-day plays with his colors or tones, and realize a beautiful city as the artist of to-day realizes a beautiful canvas or symphony. This is art indeed, the final and highest art, of which the puny art of the leisured class is but a dark-age promise and preparation.

This is art pioneering, creation extended so as to embrace life!

Those who belong to this cosmic school of art look for inspiration to its founder, Jesus Christ. His technique lay in his accurate and comprehensive control of sacred lore, his deep understanding of human nature, his exquisite mastery of parable, and his wondrous skill in healing and organization. But technique is not sufficient. His social sympathy was so sensitive, his compassion for the suffering multitudes so tender that he would serve his brothers unmindful of food and rest. But even social sympathy is not sufficient. The artistic achievement to which he devoted his personal capacity under the inspiration of the Absolute Self was nothing less than the creation in the world of the kingdom of love and progress. To this achievement he applied his marvelous technique and universal sympathy, his dauntless faith and his resurgent energy; in this achievement he summoned to his side all men of good will; and for this achievement he laid down his life to take it up again in triumphant spiritual guidance. Are we faithful to the Master in this, the highest art?

DEATH

Said Raphael hailing
Israfel, "Hark!
Voices are walling
Down in the dark!"

Hushed were the praises,
Israfel said:
"Azrael lays his
Babies in bed."

EN ROUTE

Roll rapid Pullman, riding on
Through space, O Earth!
Deep shall I sleep, when day is
gone,
In a lower berth.

From greenest blankets of the soil
Wake me with cheer,
White porters of the Son of God,
When home is near.

From *The City of Joy*, by ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT.

A PEKING LABORATORY

PAUL E. JOHNSON

Chengtzu, China

PEKING is a city of contrasts. In this, the center of world interest, in this, the apex of Oriental civilization—here if anywhere is the meeting of extremes. Here meet the farthest East and the ends of the West, the longevous past and the half-born future, the deepest wisdom and the shallowest fad, breath-taking luxury and life-robbing poverty, days of hope and nights of despair. In short, Peking is a laboratory. Its massive city wall incloses a vast human experiment.

There are no readier experimenters nor greater experiment than Peking students. Their "anti-" activities have been much overdrawn. At heart they are naturally *for* rather than *against*, as they have declared in the poster which along with the Foreign Legations' barbed wire defenses still survives the heated summer.

The Student Movement is

NOT

Bolshevik

Anti-Foreign

Anti-Christian

But a plea for humanity.

Exactly because they are such eager experimenters their psychology is for and forward. It is the psychology of youth the world over, which civilization will lose at its peril only by getting old before its time. Unfortunately the old heads sometimes misunderstand the young hearts, and to this Peking is no exception. When the students put on a demonstration the opening week of the Tariff Conference and marched in loyal support of their country's government, that government missed the point of what they were marching for and set the city's police against them.

Handicapped as these students are by irregular classes, unpaid teachers, inadequate equipment and textbooks, theirs is an opportunity strategic. A new national and cultural life is being

forged upon the anvil of the old. Here the campus is not a world remote, but an active and actual part of the community itself. The environment is more than a study hall; it is a living laboratory.

In this Peking world are myriad laboratories within laboratories. One of these is a student center, Sha Tu Yuan, of social, religious and intellectual activities. In this center during the past months a group of government university students have come together for some experimental thinking upon religious problems of to-day.

I. THE MEASURING SCALE

The student has traditionally been the learner rather than the thinker. While the educational system of China has been a marvel in classical efficiency, it has until recently opened few avenues for intellectual commerce in practical problems. This does not mean that Chinese thinkers have been impractical because, from Confucius, father of Chinese philosophy, on down to Hu Shih, leader among her latest sons, China's philosophers with few exceptions have been practical men concerned with practical affairs. However, the Chinese have out-succeeded us in the memory type of education and surpassed us in conserving the values of the past. Therefore it is so much the more significant to find the youth of China breaking over from memorizing to criticizing, from conserving to creating. The bulk of classroom procedure is still here, as in the West, simply exposure to lectures, which if they "take" will return naked to their creator on the judgment day. But the eagerness with which these students plunge into an open forum and strike out upon the high seas of a free discussion, is symptomatic of the new life that is stirring beneath the surface of old routines. If thinking is a game they are "game to play it"; if thinking is work they are here to make it work. By their thinking to-day they are making a test case of the thinking of China's yesterdays.

Even among China's recent yesterdays a problem or practical difficulty would have been effectually solved by referring it to the past. The task was simply a matter of selecting the right proverb or classical pigeon-hole and carefully laying away the issue therein.

This is a good filing system for a dead-letter office but rather inadequate technique for a laboratory. The first job in a laboratory is to work out a measuring scale capable of covering the material at hand. If old equipment falls short new apparatus must be created to register accurately or truthfully the results of experiment.

In the first discussion it became evident that the apparatus which decides questions by simply sanctioning the old and condemning the new at sight is neither accurate nor true. What is is not always right and never simply because it is. A new measuring scale, freed from prejudice and prejudgment, was needed, capable of registering and measuring the results of experiments. If an experiment is successful what does it do? It works! By their fruits shall they be known.

This the group found to be the test. What does it contribute to life personal and social? Does it make for the upbuilding or downtearing of the individual in his web of human relations? According to this measuring scale the students diagnosed what is wrong with the world very much as our Western youth are doing. They suggest selfishness, war, misunderstanding, passion and hatred, lack of truth, lack of sympathy, imperialism, crime, inequality, lack of trust in God. Focusing their thinking more concretely upon what China needs to-day, they suggest virtuous citizens, peace, education, science and material equipment, the right kind of religion, a strong, good government, a better organized army, industrial development, frontier movement, foreign capital and investment for the development of natural resources, abolition of unequal treaties, tariff autonomy. The suggestion concerning God and religion came from the one Christian student in the group and probably does not represent the entire body; but the whole trend of the thinking shows a high-minded idealism that is the foundation of all religious growth.

It was decided that these ills of the world with but two or three exceptions were age-old ills. More accurately, they have been as old as man, and no older. They are in the final analysis the eternal human problem. While the concrete needs of China call for specific development along certain concrete lines, with tools and organization, they are none the less forced back ultimately

upon the creators and wielders of the tools and the members and directors of the organizations. The problem is, How can man live successfully so as to build up life rather than tear it down? How can man not only achieve, but actually be *good*? How can the forces that play from within and without find spiritual unity? These problems of living have in every time driven man to religion. To solve his greatest problems, to meet his deepest needs man has always sought beyond himself.

Man's problems have always driven him to religion, religion has always been a way of meeting life's problems. At least this is its claim, and by common consent the class laboratory is to investigate its results.

II. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS

Almost every college catalogue carries within its covers the phrase "Qualitative Analysis." For years it was just a phrase and nothing more to me. But not until working with the actual experiments at the laboratory bench, feeling the despair of baffling reactions, reading the signs of red, green, and yellow flames, and tasting the joy of final discoveries, did its living meaning arise. The cold tabulation of Peking students' thinking may well seem barren. But to stand before their upturned faces in which play the many colored light of appreciative insight and the vivid flashes of fresh discovery is an experience of living significance.

Here stand the three great religions of China, interwoven by centuries of mingling. Where religion begins or ends is everywhere a problem; in China it is well nigh insoluble. Taoism is the comet's tail of a mystic philosopher, Confucianism is the practice of a code of social morality, Buddhism appears to the eye as series of disconnected temple grounds popular on fair days as centers of trade. For the most part these religions are accepted or rejected wholesale by the mass of people or simply taken for granted as a part of the inevitably given environment. These become our laboratory material. One by one they held the center of the stage while the students analyzed their elements and evaluated the quality of their contributions.

Buddhism passed in review as to its founder, its history in

China, its characteristic doctrines and its effect upon Chinese life. The analysis by the students brought to light the following unsatisfactory elements in Buddhism: it is too pessimistic, it promotes superstitions, it has no social activity or interest in this world, it decreases the nation's progress, it makes one too content with his present lot, it breaks down the family, and suffers from corruption among its followers. To offset these elements Buddhism has the following good qualities: it aids in keeping peace, aims toward the cutting off of desires, leads to right living, brings quietness and calmness of inner life, makes people love each other, and teaches people to enjoy the spiritual. Clearly there are values here that ought not to be lost, especially in view of the large number of evils corrected by recent reforms.

Taoism was then put upon the measuring scale of results in Chinese life. In answer to the question, How has Taoism influenced China? the students replied in four ways: it has spread superstition, it has taught the people to take no part in national life, it has organized a class professional rather than religious, it has promoted personal inactivity. While ready to admit the beauty and value of its Bible, the *Tao Teh King*, containing the philosophical sayings of Lao Tze, they insist that there is nothing in present-day Taoism to suggest any relation. By the superstitious practices into which its priesthood has allowed it to degenerate, Taoism has lost the respect of intelligent Chinese. This is literally a religious tragedy, for its best teachings show the intimate connection of all with Supreme life, set forth the clear ideal of a good man and declare that a good man must follow the Divine way. At heart it is a search for peace, freedom and naturalness.

Confucianism next came before the group, and here the contrast was striking. Whereas the students could find nothing good to say about Taoism, they had nothing bad to say about Confucianism. After an hour's discussion they declared, "In no way does Confucius hinder China." And this was not conscious dogmatism, either, for when certain negative results of Confucian influence were suggested to them they admitted the fairness of the criticism. It was rather a case of the positive values holding the field of attention completely. The ways in which Confucius helps

China were analyzed as follows: He has shown us respect for parents and aged people which builds a good family system, he preserved the ancient Chinese civilization, he saved a world from sin by giving advice, he imparted to us lofty moral ideals such as loyalty, filial piety, charity and righteousness, he made the Chinese a peaceable race, he gave China public education, he taught us to be brotherly to each other.

Such tributes as these from a generation of youth who are characterized above all by their right-about face from the past to the future is truly remarkable. An open-minded study of Chinese history and civilization largely confirms the justice of their claim. Confucius is unmistakably the father of his country. What relation does he have to the individual Chinese life? In order to get at this issue the students began earnestly to search for the influence of Confucius on "my" life. The results of this search brought forth a testimony meeting that was at once experimental and experiential. It was understood that each man was to speak for himself alone, not thinking for the time being what Confucius had done for others but what he has done for "me." Fifteen students testified as follows:

1. He has helped me to have a good manner (to be polite).
2. He has given me morality, knowledge of ancient classics and bravery.
3. He has helped me to respect my fellow men.
4. He has taught me how to study.
5. He has helped me to have a good character.
6. He has helped me to be true, loyal and faithful.
7. He has helped me to be temperate.
8. He has helped me to be kind.
9. He has taught me "to do not unto others what I would not like to have them do unto me."
10. He has taught me to be an obedient son.
11. He has taught me how to live in the world.
12. He has taught me to know and to do (that is, to act upon what I know).
13. He has taught me to be thoughtful.
14. He has taught me to work hard.
15. He has taught me not to believe in God.

The last testimony that he has taught me not to believe in God was protested in chorus by other students, but as every man's

testimony is as good as another's it remained on the records. The Sayings of Confucius suggest that Confucius believed in God, but there is no evidence that he found a way of direct access to him. The one group was especially interested in the question, Is Confucianism a religion? After discussing it at some length they decided it was not a religion because it gives no way of finding God. Furthermore, the striking statement 'of Confucius' saving a world from sin by giving advice will hardly bear up because Confucius' theory of human nature does not recognize sin. Something more than advice is surely needed to save a world, but practical moral teaching which makes clear how right differs from wrong and presents righteousness and obligation in so beautiful a way as to make them appealing is the first step in an effective saving religious program. Therefore Confucianism cannot be set in contradiction to religion, for the distinctions are matters of degree rather than opposition. Throughout the entire discussion I felt that we were on crucial ground. For if these students should reject their highest ethical approach to religion what hope of their coming to religion itself? and if they should reject their greatest moral leader what hope of their following any religious leader? But they did not reject these values under critical examination. The conclusion of the experiments so far is a clear knowledge of and a steadier loyalty to the best qualities that emerge from their analytical study.

III. RELIGION IN THE BALANCE

Few critics of college life would care to assert that students of to-day are religious. Youth's dash for freedom has thrown off the shackles of religious authority before any other. And yet in the city which gave birth to the present Anti-Religion Movement, students are surprisingly interested in religion.

The nature of their interest in religion is indicated by the type of questions they raised. In the order of asking these were: What is the Christian religion? Is there any contradiction between religion and science? Is religion necessary to the most civilized as well as to the most savage peoples? What is the relation between religion and education? How does religion solve social

problems? Will religion progress in proportion to civilization? Is Christianity the best religion? Do religions conflict, how different and how alike? What is the value of religion? What is the difference between ancient and modern Christianity? Are there any faults in religions? When all evils no longer exist in humankind what need of religion? Have animals any religion? What do Christians think about the origin of the species? Is there any conflict between patriotism and religion, between war and religion? Such questions reveal an earnest effort to discover the place of religion in solving the problems of their own world.

The key question is, What is the value of religion? Do we need religion or do we not need religion? On this issue the student group divided. Some held that religion is not needed for the following reasons: it is contradictory to science, it prevents the individual development and evolution of men by bondage to superstition, it limits our thought by church authority, it is perhaps needed by the common people, but is not needed by me because I can master everything by myself, it is evil because it is made use of by bad or ambitious people for wrong-doing. Others believed that we do need religion for the following reasons: religion is a good way of guiding people to do right, it makes people do benevolence, it develops human character, it gives everyone an opportunity to be educated by means of its sacred books, it teaches how to use knowledge, it turns man away from luxury and personal ambition to spiritual things, thus bringing comfort to the soul, it makes for the right use of science, it comforts those in sad conditions, it is the power which can keep human beings from misdoings which are beyond human self-control, it is necessary to make men love each other, it is the fundamental way to lead men to the golden age.

These judgments upon religion were listed in parallel columns before the group where each for himself could weigh the issues. Facing the matter thus squarely no one of us could deny that there are two sides to the question with some weight on either side. In simple honesty how could I dodge these criticisms of religion? The negative side did weigh upon me. Much of religion *is* contradictory to science, much of religion *has* bound men to superstition, much of religion *does* limit free thinking by church authority, and

all too often religion is made use of by ambitious people for wrongdoing. I felt it and I said it. If I had never heard of any other religion than Christianity still I should have had to say it.

But this is only one side of the scales. If religion measured in the balance may be found wanting, it is also found promising. This the students were eager to admit. The balance was on the whole in favor of religion. Life with value is better than without. The positive features of religion are undeniably desirable. The charges against religion are serious, and yet every man of the group, with the exception of one (and he also later), felt religion valuable if true. They were not sure religion could carry the weight of its objectionable features, but if once freed of these it could not reasonably be rejected.

It then became evident to the group that everything depends upon the kind of a religion you have. If you take the objections to religion as jagged rocks to steer away from, your course should point in the general direction of the right kind of religion. So having already charted these rocks the students set out to discover what is a good religion. What is the highest kind of religion you can think of? There may not be any such religion in existence, but if not there ought to be, and we ought to begin thinking about it. These are the student findings. A good religion should not be superstitious but scientific, should be universal and impartial, should consist of truth, high ideals, and the spirit of morality, should develop spiritual life, should be practicable and serviceable, should help people do good and keep them from doing wrong, should not only tell of good done by great men in the past but also should show why we ought to do good ourselves, should have a certain spiritual being to worship and obey, should not hinder civilization but should promote progress, should not be instrumental to gain or ambition, but should have a virtuous influence upon mankind.

This is what these Chinese students want in a religion. Will this religion be Christianity? I hope so, but it is by no means clear. Much of the Christianity brought here for distribution has serious difficulty in meeting the first two of these tests. So far as I can see there is no hope that a Christianity which opposes science,

preaches select election, and denies brotherhood will become acceptable to Chinese minds.

IV. CHRISTIANITY IN THE CRUCIBLE

At this point the students turned to examine Christianity. Christianity the world around is being tried in the white heat of crucial experiences. The assumptions of her supremacy, authority, and infallibility are being challenged. There may have been a time when the Christian Church had a monopoly upon truth and salvation spiritual, upon kingdom and government material, but that day is not to-day. The secular goods are contesting the religious values. These conditions are becoming apparent to Chinese eyes facing westward. One returned student published a book fifteen years ago in which he confesses that the inscrutable Oriental is baffled by the mysterious psychology of the Occidental. It is only reasonable that a besieged city should reserve all its forces to maintain a better defense from within. Yet at the very time when Christianity is being vitally attacked at home she sends forth her warriors by the thousands upon a foreign expedition. When the religious and moral foundations of the West seem to be crumbling her sons go forth to preach the gospel of an infallible Western civilization. With Chicago leading the cities of the world in murders, can anything good come out of Chicago? Here, it must be admitted, is a problem for both Chicago and Peking. If Christianity does not work in America what hope that it will work in China? We may deny that Christianity has ever been tried, but how can we deny that we have at least tried to try it?

But leaving America and Europe out of account China has had her own problems with Christianity and Christians. That China's own house is not in order to-day has some remote relation to the ordered policies of other houses. "Christian" business men, statesmen, and it must also be said, missionaries, have given the Chinese some cause to doubt the value of Christianity. The wonder is not the anti-Christian gesture in China, but the long-suffering patience of this self-restrained people. Christianity is in the crucible here for reasons common to all places plus reasons grown natively and naturally on Chinese soil.

A few of these reasons suggest themselves in the following criticisms of Christianity made by the Peking students. Belief in God is superstition because we cannot find him. A man should be independent rather than relying wholly upon God. Some Christian clergymen use their religion to make money and do not treat the people rightly. Christian missions is a step toward imperialism, a tool in the hands of greedy nations. In China Christian schools have encroached upon national education by establishing a different kind without considering what the Chinese want. It is making the Chinese people slavish and submissive in nature, flattering to foreigners. Missionaries usually oppress the common people by favoring those who are Christians. Divisions into denominations cause misunderstandings. If Christianity is a spiritual religion for simple worship, why so much form in the churches? Christians pray every day, but can gain nothing because there is no God.

The last of these criticisms came from a graduate of a Christian Middle School, and together with the first two touch the vital point in the difficulties that are the most universal with all questioners of religion. As one student pointed out, these are the deepest issues, for if they can be solved the others do not matter because they are simply failures among Christians and do not imperil the actual value of Christianity itself. The other difficulties are serious, and until removed will block honest seekers from getting to Christianity pure. But with earnest students on the scent of a larger issue, the issue of finding God and his way of life among the tangled despairs of men, the minor matters must step aside. The more urgent questions, Is there a God? Do we need him? Can we find him?—these have the right of way.

And this led the group directly to Jesus. To him God is the greatest reality in life, for him God is the deepest need of perfection-hungry humanity, by him God may be found even as he has found him. With the living figure of Jesus before us, it was easy to distinguish between Christ and Christians. Defining Christianity in terms of Christ, measuring it upon the dimensions of him, the students volunteered the judgment, "This is what we meant by a good religion."

After the discussion closed that night, the keenest man in the group walked with me the mile to the car line at Ch'ien Men. Already while yet in his second year at Normal University, he is in the editorial rooms of one of Peking's leading Chinese newspapers. It was he who had suggested Confucius saved a world by giving advice, it was he who said, "Religion is not needed because I can master everything by myself," and again, "Belief in God is a superstition because we cannot find him," and who had spoken for the group in saying that if this could be solved the lesser matters would not matter. As we walked he said, "These hours of thinking together have convinced me that I do need religion." "What do you think of Jesus?" I asked. "I worship him with my whole mind." "That is my definition of a Christian," I replied. "Would you classify yourself that way?" "As you have explained Christianity I am willing to."

The important part of a laboratory is the *labor*. Scales of measurement, analytical studies, careful weighings and thorough testings all have their place and justification as and only as they lead the experimenter to work and better work. The final test of this thinking together in Peking is not yet in sight.

GLORIFYING GOD IN ARCHITECTURE

WILLIAM S. MITCHELL

Worcester, Mass.

SPIRITUAL experience is not ordinarily associated with church building. The average preacher thinks of such a task as one appointed for those men fitted by training and experience for this peculiar service and one devoutly to be avoided for one's peace of mind and saving of soul. However, for the man who approaches the building of a great house for God in the spirit of the old cathedral builders (and there are more than one dreams) there are few experiences in ministry which are comparable in spiritual satisfaction.

Architecture is a language through which men learned to express their noblest emotions long before the pen, the brush had been mastered. Its elements are as simple as the alphabet and have been picked up, most of them, here and there as men have builded. With them it is possible to speak in dialect or voice the exaltation of the soul's loftiest moods. Like language, architecture has also its bad grammar, its poor syntax, not to mention its slang. If a seemingly stone pillar resting on a wooden pedestal isn't an offense against architectural grammar and if the rococo jumble of the average movie palace isn't slang, then, in the name of good architecture, what are they?

Ralph Adams Cram, to whom, with Goodhue, America owes most for the modern renaissance of the Gothic in church architecture, tells us that the era of bad taste in America began with the election of Andrew Jackson as President. Presumably this was because that particular election signified the passing of popular power from the older and more cultured regions of the Atlantic seaboard to those ruder, more democratic regions west of the mountains. Be that as it may, no student of American church architecture need seek long before he becomes aware that a new and nobler hour is upon us in our church building. Apparently the long

reign of the "meeting house" in America is nearing its end and the day of the cathedral is entering.

If there was one thing characteristic of those old cathedral builders it was the love, the reverence, the devotion, the worship which they builded into their slow-rising structures. Looking upon the lifting wonder of some cathedral spire one might paraphrase Joyce Kilmer's lines on "Trees":

I think my soul can ne'er aspire
As yonder steeple's leaping fire;

A lifting hand to touch the sky
Close to the place where God is nigh.

A spire which climbs to God all day
And ever lifts its soul to pray;

A height which crowns man's loftiest wall,
As though its reach would match his fall,

And clutch at God with eager need
To save by faith the Woman's seed.

I never see a mounting spire
But my own soul is lifted higher!

Those ancient walls were sanctified by time. Their slow building demanded the sacrifices of ages and that sacrifice for God, for God's House, wove the ages together until every such building became veritably the worship of the community which reared it.

Is it possible in these days, when we build cathedrals in a single generation, when, by power of steam and machinery, it is possible for us to compass with our construction in a year what required in father's days a lifetime, to build into our buildings that selfsame devotion of the older builders? There are some of us who believe it is.

Every great church is a sacrament of sacrifice. With not a few church buildings erected and in course of erection costing over a half million and a few more than a million we are probably in the second great church-building era of Methodism. The first, in the late sixties and early seventies, gave us such noble structures as Mount Vernon Place, Baltimore; Delaware Avenue, Buffalo;

Arch Street, Philadelphia; and Tremont Street, Boston. This later era has already given us the magnificent Metropolitan in Detroit, First Church in Pasadena, and First Church, Los Angeles, the beautiful temple in Gary, and the new Wesley in Worcester. Such churches do not come easily. They are the visualizing of the faith, the love, the devotion and the sacrifice of their builders.

If these churches we are building are indicative of the mood of the leaders and the laymen who are building them we are entering upon a new hour in Protestant worship in which the older symbolism of the liturgical churches is to find a new, a fresh expression. The introducing of the conventional altar, and its adornment with the cross (and not infrequently with even the candles) and the exchange of our conventional Protestant chancel setting for the older Gothic form with its balanced lectern and box pulpit, is giving considerable concern to some who see in these practices the decay of Protestantism and a return to popery. This is not true. This is the reaction from the barrenness and bleakness with which Puritan Protestantism left our American churches. How little there has been in the average Protestant church to suggest even the atmosphere of worship as we enter. We have given the place of honor to the organ and the choir and in successive degrees of decreasing visibility and honor we have given place to the pulpit, the communion table and the Methodist altar, successor to and development out of the old-time "mourners' bench." With little to remind us of God's presence, for all our faith that he is here, we have tacitly forgotten that and permitted the very place of his message and reminder to be turned into a lecture platform, a dramatic stage, a concert hall, even a movie palace, and again and again have even extended our stage over and concealed the altar where our communicants seek God and our sinners come seeking their Saviour! It is high time the tide turned if our churches are to continue to be regarded as God's Houses at all.

There are few more interesting studies than our Protestant emphasis of certain doctrines and beliefs through our church architecture. The continental Lutheran supremely venerates the Book and the pulpit. Those who have seen the typical Lutheran pulpit

abroad, with its lower platform for the conduct of the service and the reading of the announcements, and its lofty place of preaching, gained by steep stairs, from which nothing but the preaching of the word of God is permitted, will never cease to remember its impressiveness as an object lesson on the place of preaching in Protestantism. Equally impressive is the altar-like desk on which the great Bible lies, open during service, closed at its conclusion, a reverent attitude which every Mason will understand. Compared with this our customary American pulpits are meaningless things indeed. Apparently, in our Puritan desire to escape from every suggestion of popery we have well nigh stripped the setting of our religion of all its suggestiveness and symbolism. That symbolism we are now engaged in restoring to our churches.

These new churches we are building have forsaken the hybrid architecture which succeeded the stately Georgian of colonial days and regions. Builders apparently ran riot for a generation or more in their planning of structures for church use. The utilitarian strictly ruled. The preacher and the listener must be supremely served, hence the circular seating and the amphitheater effect of many churches of a decade or so ago. Audiences being the thing in mind, the convertible church was invented by some genius, making it possible to throw into one room an Akron-type Sunday-school room and the religious audience room. Since this was never done for purposes of worship but chiefly for those of amusement or mass meeting the only effect noticeable upon the equipment for worship was a makeshift pulpit commanding the united audience rooms. Since song played an important part in the type of worship used in these churches the organ was moved from its old-time position in the rear balcony and was installed as the most prominent object in the chancel, and the choir, usually unsurplised, was grouped around it and immediately behind the pulpit chairs. All made for that free and easy atmosphere which for too long has characterized the worship of our American churches, and in which it is difficult to either secure or assume a worshipful attitude.

The modern renaissance of the Gothic has sent us back to the great fountain springs of church architecture in the splendid old

cathedrals of Europe and as their standards have won new acceptance they have carried with them fresh interest in their glories of glass, of carving and tracery, of arch and pillar. It was inevitable that such changes should bring about the restoration of the older chancel treatment and the restraint of time-honored custom in the matter of the planning and ornamentation of our churches. While we are suffering, in this transitional period, from an occasional flagrant violation of the ancient canons of church architecture, due to architect or minister, not to mention lay prejudices, yet we are building churches for worship where yesterday we build for everything but worship. To find the awe and silence and consciousness of the Divine Presence in Protestant churches upon entering them is a relief and a cause for rejoicing. Our children will be reared with a reverence and respect for the House of God.

But there is an obligation incumbent upon the builders of these modern Protestant cathedrals—that we shall not lose the old, fervent spirit of our fathers' simpler worship. We must prove that it is possible to save souls in a cathedral as well as a meeting house. We must save faith from formalism and the chill cold of ritual. We must permeate our worship in these new surroundings with the old experimental spirit of the circuit riders. Before us there are two ways. One leads back into the very coldness and ritualism from which our founder, John Wesley, led us forth. The other leads forward into a real renaissance not of architecture but of that simple, humble faith, that childlike devotion out of which those ancient structures came. God grant that we may achieve this latter and escape the former, and then, with that slow enrichment which comes with living with and loving a building through succeeding generations, let us hallow these new cathedrals with the memories of those whom we have loved, and add year by year to the glory of their fabric in glass, in stone, in ornament and structure till they become the symbols of a community's devotion.

THE DREAMS OF GOD

God dreamed a dream, and in a garden fair
 Set man, and at his side a woman there.
 And hand in hand they walked beneath the trees
 In happy innocence: and heard in every breeze,
 No less than in the thunders of the heaven,
 The voice of Him, by whom their life was given.

Sweet was each dawn, and tender was each night,
 So free, so innocent in thought and sight;
 Could bliss be more? Could rapture still increase?
 Could there be greater wonder, deeper peace?
 Fled by the days, and gave no heed to time,
 For life was holy, life was then sublime.

Such was the scene: then in a fateful hour
 The deed was done: and 'neath their shameful bower,
 They heard the voice of One upraised in wrath,
 And saw the flaming sword across their path.
 Seek not to know by whom the ruin came,
 Who but their God can right apportion blame?
 Opened the flood-gates of our mortal woe,
 Sin, sorrow, death, the stricken world o'erflow.

God dreamed again, and in a garden fair,
 Set Man, to wrestle for deliverance there.
 Set Him, who only of the sons of men,
 Could look the Father in the face again.
 So great the load, so heavy was the rod,
 The cry went up, "O let it pass, My God."
 Unanswered prayer, what blessing from it flows.
 To death the deathless One for sinners goes.

Lonely He hung. The crowd had slunk away,
 This was the testing time, and this the day
 When hearts were sifted, and the thoughts made known,
 And in the test, a woman stands alone.
 In man's undoing woman played her part,
 In man's redemption true, and brave of heart.

Men saw Him hang in pain, and scoffed and jeered,
 And others laughed and clapped, and others cheered,
 But in His agony He had one balm,
 That soothed His broken heart, and made Him calm;
 One tender act had wrapped His soul in mail,
 And made the fiercest darts of malice fail.

For as He died in love to win our loss,
A woman's perfume floats around His cross.

God still has dreams, and in a garden fair
Sees man and woman walk, a perfect pair.
Man is no longer lord, or woman fool.
No longer, "Thou must serve, and I must rule."
No longer innocent or blindly gay,
No longer walking in an unknown way.

Heaven is on earth. Thus earth a garden fair.
Hard was the weeding, plowing, sowing there.
In pain and sweat of blood was knowledge bought,
In gropings blind and long the light was sought.
But in the end they reach the age-long quest,
And know the worst, yet gladly choose the best.
Virtue instead of innocence we find,
And man and woman one in heart and mind.

Earth was a garden fair, and shall be, too.
God dreams, and all *His* dreams come true!

CHARLES CLOSE.

Isle of Wight, England.

NEMESIS OF JUSTICE

Far, far a-field on new-dropt snow
I traveled where I should not go
And thought that none would ever know
The tracks were mine. When I returned
By that same trail my conscience burned
As jingled loud the wages earned
Through night of sin; and still I thought
That to no others I had brought
A sign of ill. My thought was naught:
For, as I far and farther walked
I saw I had been plainly stalked
By younger feet. Example talked.
More eloquent than words of mine
Were these my foot-prints and the sign
Of my misdeeds. Revenge condign
And just befell me when I knew
'Twas my own son that trailed me true.

J. D. GILLILAN.

Filler, Idaho.

PILGRIM AUREOLE

Good pilgrims coming home from Mecca wear
 A band of green around their turbaned fez;
 Kneel more devoutly on their rug of prayer
 To meditate on what Mohammed says.
 They bow the head in kebla's holy niche
 Or count their alms on amber, golden-rich.

So we returning from Christ's birthplace land
 Wear on our brow a fiery, glowing brand,
 For we have climbed the Saviour's Walk up hills
 Of Nazareth when His Spirit sweetly fills
 The evening air with fragrant sanctity
 And our perplexities gained clarity
 Of stars, that stooped to lend their friendly light
 And helped us find Him in the Nazareth night.

Crusader, pilgrim, priest and wanderer
 In His country whole-heartedly aver
That travel in His land incarnates Him,
 Makes His whole story leave the page grown dim,
 Take shapes that even we may comprehend:
 Hills leave the Psalms where David planted them;
 On Olivet, winds still their soothing send;
 And roads still mount that felt His garment's hem.
 The Via Dolorosa is a street
 We climbed to-day, a steep and dark retreat
 Of sin and suffering—and Calvary
 Is at its end, where on the pious knee
 Men mingle many creeds to prove their praise
 And even minarets their cries upraise.
 Gethsemane's a garden where men pray
 And Bethany still smiles in sun-lit way;
 The sheep He loved still heed their shepherd's call
 And patient ass bears yet the loads of all.

So we returning from His birthplace land
 Feel on our brow a fiery, glowing brand;
 For we have climbed the Saviour's Walk up hills
 Of Nazareth when His Spirit sweetly fills
 The evening air with fragrant sanctity,
 And our perplexities gained clarity
 Of stars that stooped to lend their friendly light
And helped us find Him in the Nazareth night!

MADELEINE SWEENEY MILLER.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

BIMONTHLY BREVITIES

KENOSIS is a fine phrase for doctrinal discussion. Better than that is the high practical value of that Pauline statement about our Lord, "found in fashion as a man." We need not know everything about God, how he might disclose himself to angels, nor how he might stoop to speak to the brutes that perish, but to man he must reveal himself as Man. And so he came, the Eternal Word, not speaking the mystic language of the upper world, nor displaying signs and symbols taken from the seraphic sphere but spelling out the Divine nature in human speech, interpreting himself in a human life and blazing as Shekinah on the altar of a human heart. Theology has probably placed too much emphasis on those ontological attributes which were largely laid aside (Paul's phrase is "emptied himself") in the manifestation of God in the flesh.

"**WHATSOEVER** is born of God hath overcome the world." Natural birth may often face defeat but spiritual birth is a triumph, the victory of a conquering vitalism. Life is always in conflict with mere mechanics; it annuls and defies the lower physical forces. The seed lays its tribute on earth and air. Gravitation says "Keep down!" but the living germ defies that force that sways planets and builds its palace of green not in the ground but in the upper air. So the divine birth lays the earth under tribute; it fights the forces of worldliness and overcomes that restless moral gravitation that drags us down. It makes the very universe a ladder by which we may climb to the realm beyond the skies.

MODERN fastidiousness sometimes shrinks from the awful mystery of blood, and those who are loudest in proclaiming that "God is Love" are frequently the first to forget that blood means

love in its highest expression. Love is at its best in sacrifice. As blood is everywhere in natural life, love, of which it is a symbol, is everywhere in the realm of grace. It sprinkles all the lintel posts of creation and Jesus has carried it into the heavenly places. For love in God means sacrifice, just as it does in man. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world and still on the eternal throne is the Lamb that was slain.

EVEN the Weather Bureau does not know all about wind, and much less can earthly knowledge trace the course of the Breath of God, as to "whence it cometh or whither it goeth." As the south wind comes from far and snow-clad Lebanon dissolves into showers that water the valleys, and cause grapes, peaches and oranges to blossom on wind-kissed plains, so the Spirit as a wind borne from the mountains of God brings forth the fruit of the Spirit in human lives. "Awake, O North Wind, and come, O South, and breathe upon my garden that the spices thereof may blow forth."

"**RIGHTEOUSNESS** and peace have met together; mercy and truth have kissed each other." Only at the Cross do they meet. Here join the treble and bass in one grand harmony. Here embrace those two angels, one grandly stern and the other softly tender. The mercy seat with its sprinkled hood lies above the law, the rainbow of mercy is round about the throne of justice. In the Cross, all antinomies are resolved and heaven touches earth. The Song of Moses keys itself to the same music with the Song of the Lamb. In the midst of the throne, in the center of the universal sovereignty of God is the Slain Lamb. Mercy is enthroned in the heart of Justice.

SALVATION was made by the Cross to reach as far as the Fall of man. Wherever earth's darkness glooms, God's light shall shine; wherever pain has tortured, heaven's healing shall be felt; wherever sin has soiled the soul and kindled in it the blush of shame, the cleansing of Jesus' blood may be experienced and the tears of penitence glisten in the sunshine of reconciliation; wherever the black raven of remorse has plunged his beak into the aching heart, the White Dove of the Spirit shall make his peaceful

nest; wherever sorrow has sighed and grief has groaned, joy shall shout; and wherever death has darkened a door, angels of hope shall bring their lamps and angels of immortality blow the trumpets of the everlasting morning.

PURITY of heart promised by Jesus is more than merely a restored innocence. That can never be recovered but something better can be attained. A holiness which depended upon ignorance of evil or isolation in a monastery would be of little worth. The true symbol of Christian holiness is not the white and fragile lily which a touch can soil and an hour can fade; it is rather the diamond, whose beauty is born of fire and stress, which holds the flame of sunlight stored up in its heart, undimmed by dust and unquenched by water. Holiness is more than mere innocence; it is an achieved perfect Love.

PETER was a man of impulse who "toiled all night and took nothing," but he was also a man of action who said, "At thy word I will let down the nets." He was not an invertebrate soul, wholly lacking will and purpose, one who, instead of breasting waves and conquering tides, can only drift like the medusæ, all limp and languid in the current of circumstance. Such men do not become apostles. Poor is the life spent solely in the subjective mood, among "mights" and "shoulds," where "I will" waits upon "I would." The truest and worthiest life is rather divided between the indicative and the imperative. But remember that in the divine grammar "Thou wilt" is the first person and "I will" a far-off second.

HOLY Thursday, the eve of Good Friday, should not be neglected in the Holy Week of the Passion of Our Lord. It was the birthday of the Lord's Supper, which is, as Naville says, "in all churches the most solemn act of worship." Not transubstantiation nor consubstantiation, but a Real Presence, won by faith and personal communion with Christ, should be realized as the visible Bread and Wine become spiritual ladders by which we lift up our hearts to meet his heart in fellowship. As to those crass and materialistic dogmas, most of us will be quite willing to accept (with

our own personal interpretation) the lines written by Queen Elizabeth:

He was the Word and spake it,
He took the bread and brake it.
And that which he did make it
I do believe and take it.

MARK records of many invalids who longed to touch the garments of the passing Christ that "as many as touched him were made whole." And there is only one whole and perfect life that any human soul can live. Jesus is the complement of our human defect. That taint of defection or imperfection which is upon all things earthly vanishes by contact with his fullness. Sooner shall the ocean fail to feed the fountains and the sun to kindle the answering fires of earth's color and beauty, than the Son of Man from his unfailing health and perfect holiness to supply all the wants and deficiencies of time. Even through the robes of his outward appearances streams virtue. May its fringe sweep all as he passes by!

JESUS is the perfect pattern. We have no picture of his face and form, but we have the most complete portrait of his life and character and it challenges the critical scrutiny of the world. We cannot destroy Christianity by demolishing the church or confuting its creeds; we must first get rid of him. Surely the world does not need any new religion. Our own will not be worn out until all earth becomes as good as Jesus.

WHICH Jesus should we imitate? The Crucified or the Glorified One? Surely we must follow the former to ever be like the latter. We must be willing to take up his cross and share his sacrifice, to become like him and so win his crown. The life walk that follows our Lord leads through trials, temptations, the abodes of sorrow and the fields of service to reach the highlands of grace and godliness and at last the hills of glory.

IMITATION of Christ does not destroy individuality. It will take the lives of all of us to make up one Christ. The earth is fair with thousands of flowers of varied hues, but they are all painted

from the white rays of one sun. All colors join to make the solar splendor of white light. So we can find rich variety in the imitators of Jesus. Martyrs wrapped in flame, confessors bearing his cross in their hearts as well as on their breasts, missionaries burning with his love and message, kings and beggars all have walked in his footsteps.

MYSTICISM, in a more concrete and experimental and less semi-pantheistic form, is breaking forth into poetry to-day. Eva Gore-Booth, in her *The House of Three Windows*, writes these verses, entitled "Symbols":

In a vision of delight
I saw heaven last night;
And all the people of the earth were there—
Golden harps by the golden air
Swept into rhythms of light and flame
Rang out the everlasting name,
All names above;
And every soul was casting down
The Crown of Life, the victor's crown,
Before the great white throne of living Love.

Perhaps not deeply practical, but highly spiritual.

PROSPERITY, the favorite slogan of the partisan politicians of to-day, has by them been debased in its definition to mean merely property. Yet it is very doubtful whether financial wealth is a source of true human prosperity. Many poor folks get more real pleasure out of their life of love and service than most millionaires out of their money. One of our woman poets (Margaret Widemar) recently wrote these lines:

Now that I have nothing
I am what God employs—
All I could have never been
While I had golden toys.

PLATO in his dialogue, *Phædrus*, speaks of "those things in which God abides and in beholding which he is what he is" (Jowett's version). Höfding in his little book, *The Problems of Philosophy*, states it thus: "That which makes God godlike." It is not necessary for us to ask speculatively how did God achieve and

realize his highest personality? A more profound and far more practical question is, where can man find God at his best? Certainly nowhere but in Jesus, the God-man. It is only a Christlike God that sufficiently solves the problems of head and heart. Höfding's fine philosophical description of religion as the "conservation of values" surely gives Christians the right to hold fast to that highest value in nature, history and life which is Jesus Christ.

CONSCIENCE lays its sword of self-condemnation at the feet of Christ. The Redeemer is nearer than the Judge. Higher to our hearts is Calvary, the hill of the Gospel, than Sinai, the mountain of Law; dearer than the white throne of judgment is the blood-sprinkled mercy seat. Great is God in knowledge, greater in holiness, but greatest in love. He does know our guilt, but better still, knows his Son and thus our debt is discharged. He never sees our sin but in the light of the Cross. So the Father God is greater than conscience, for conscience can only see our guilt, but he sees and mends it. While conscience with no pity writes down our doom with an iron pen, God with the crimson mercy of the Cross will blot it out forever. "For if our heart condemn us, God is greater than our heart and knoweth all things." 1 John 3. 20.

LUDWIG VAN BEETHOVEN, pupil of Haydn, musical successor to Mozart, and genuine follower of Johann Sebastian Bach, deaf in his later years to all earthly sounds and voices, passed into the hearing of celestial choruses March 26, 1827, one hundred years ago. While not such a writer of wonderful religious oratorios as was Bach, he was doubtless the true creator of the romantic type of music by his mastery of the polyphonic element. If this centennial of his memory is used by all pianists and orchestras by repeating his many sonatas and nine symphonies, it will aid in silencing the jungle jazz of the saxophone, and the wretched ragtime of silly soloists, and bring back the seraphic melody, the holy rhythm and the heavenly harmony of truly artistic music. Beethoven did occasionally admit syncopation, melodic peculiarities and harsh discords, as color, into his compositions, but neither he nor any other artist ever allowed those barbarous bits to be the substance of their creations. The decadent music of to-day, born

of revived savagery, is destructive not only of the Beautiful, but of the True and the Good.

A FRANCISCAN poet, recently quoted in this METHODIST REVIEW, Giacomone dei Benedetti, by order of Pope Boniface VIII, at whom he had flung fearful invectives deeply deserved by that contemptible and cruel bishop of Rome, was imprisoned in a horrible dungeon for five years, and when released returned to his convent to die there in 1306. Probably the Holy Roman Church has not fully forgiven his savage attacks on that unholy Pope, yet he has been highly honored by the use of his great hymn, *Stabat Mater*, in the liturgy. Dr. A. J. Bucher, editor of the Christliche Apologete, has sent us this epitaph, seen on his grave in the crypt of the Church of S. Fortunato at Todi: *Ossa B Iacononi de Benedictis, Tudertini, qui, stultus propter Christum, nova mundum arte delusit, et coelum rapuit*. Here is a free translation: "The bones of the Blessed Giacomone dei Benedetti da Todi, who, as a Fool for the sake of Christ, by an artifice mystified the world and seized heaven by storm." Even Dante puts Pope Boniface in hell, calls him the "Prince of the new Pharisees" and declares that "every one of his enemies was a Christian" (*Inferno*, Canto 27, 85ff.). The holiest and ablest of the mediæval Christians, although they accepted the Roman faith, would not yield to any temporal power of the Pope.

"RELATIVITY opens the way to God." So argued Dr. Filmer Northrup, a Yale professor of philosophy, before the Students' Conference at Milwaukee, Wis. He alleged that science is entirely ineffective in the explanation of the universe and that the same is true of the realistic conception of life. Here is the substance of a reported portion of his address:

The theory of relativity, defining the universe in mathematical terms, does, however, give humanity a weapon with which to solve existence of God in terms that never change. It places the universe on the basis of pure reason, on the basis by which Plato was able to reach an understanding of life and of God. When people grasp this theory and the fourth dimension, both requiring transcendental reasoning, they will have come close to the secret of the universe.

He also strongly condemned much of the present teaching of science in universities, declaring that "Present-day science leads only to madness." Unquestionably he is right in demanding that more be seen in the universe than mere masses and energy perpetually changing. Anyone who uses more than mere physical sense in the study of Nature can see God.

ASTRONOMY and allied sciences have led Dr. Heber D. Curtis, director of the Allegheny Observatory, to believe in the future life after death. In an address made before the American Association for the Advancement of Science on the "Unity of the Universe," he remarked:

I personally find it impossible to regard Handel's "Largo," Keats' "Ode to a Grecian Urn" and the higher ethics as mere by-products of the chemical interaction of a collection of hydrocarbon molecules. With energy, matter, space and time continuous, with nothing lost or wasted, are we ourselves the only manifestation that comes to an end, ceases, is annihilated at threescore years and ten? . . . What we crudely call the spirit of man makes new compounds, plays with the laws of chemical action, guides the forces of the atom, changes the face of the earth, gives life to new forms and takes it away from millions of animals and plants. Here is a flame that controls its own flaming. A creative spirit which cannot reasonably be less than the continuity it controls. . . . This thing, soul, mind or spirit, cannot well be an exception. In some way, as yet impossible to define, it, too, must possess continuity. The concept is old and the arguments older, but the conclusion seems inevitable.

While he admitted that "there is a gap between the world of matter and of spirit," he does see that there is no mechanistic explanation of thought, feeling and will.

IRONIC poetry often possesses considerable moral value. Henry S. Salt puts real salty savor as well as stinging sarcasm into such a stanza as this:

Great is brute force and will prevail;
Our faith is in the strong-mailed fist;
We worship Might that makes men quail;
We're Fascist, we're Imperialist.
In Power we trust—all else will pass—
In Thought we don't believe one wee bit;
Not *Veritas*, but *Feritas*
Magna est et prevalebit.

So it is not Veracity but Ferocity which is to prevail! Not Man the blessed Brother, but Man the battling Beast shall conquer the earth! Not so! It is a sacred sanity born of holy love that is to save humanity from its stupid brutality. Not *Homo Rapiens* (the title of Mr. Salt's volume), but *Homo Sapiens*, not the rapacity but the righteous sagacity of mankind, that will make to-morrow no longer the jungle of brutes but the kingdom of God.

REASON AND IMMORTALITY

"If a man die shall he live again?" that world-old question, asked in sorrow by Job, is as fresh to-day as ever. Those three problems of human thought, God, Duty and Immortality, as stated by Kant, are closely related. Is the soul of man only a white interrogation mark, lifted up on the black margin of the world to ask one answerless question and then be erased forever? It is a practical problem, one which affects our ideals of life. Immortality furnishes an enlarged view of the dignity of human nature and a wider range of the purposes of life.

Eschatology, the doctrines concerning the last things, the final portion of Christian theology, is perhaps the one most widely discussed and with most varied conclusions. The literature on the subject is immense and now reaches more than seven thousand titles. Volumes on this theme continue to be published, but all the purely rational arguments concerning the future life are in their substance at least as old as Plato. In presenting the alleged intellectual proofs of immortality, all must admit their frailty as compared with the life of Jesus, his physical resurrection and his personal presence in spiritual communion. Yet, as will be seen by all who can look behind and beyond all these arguments from reason, Christ actually certifies the major premise without which none of these merely minor premises could surely reach the conclusion that man is immortal.

First comes the *psychological* argument, not, of course, reached by any physical analysis of mental, emotional or moral attributes. The nature of the soul is reached directly by the human consciousness itself, and not through the senses. Do we have

a soul? Here are some queer conundrums whose answers are not so absurd as they may seem to be:

"What is mind?" "No matter." "What is matter?" "Never mind." "What is the spirit?" "It is entirely immaterial."

Spirit can claim the same sort of evidence concerning its reality as we have of material things. It is simply that essential inference made by reflection upon our perceptions of phenomena. Our five bodily senses deal with a realm of extension in which are found shape, size, resistance, color, scent, sound, and other attributes. Those attributes, perceived by eyes, ears, hands and other physical methods, we call matter. But we have another, and indeed closer, range of experiences, such as thought, emotion, volition, realized in reason, imagination, love, desire, hope, etc., which we call, variedly, mind, soul and spirit. This conscious dualism invades all philosophy. Even that great pantheist Spinoza had to divide experience into thought and extension. While it is doubtless true that physical phrases are used to state mental experiences, yet it is absurd to assign sensuous attributes to the soul, or *vice versa*. Feeling may be a term ascribed both to bodily sensations and to mental emotion, yet no one would accept size to measure a soul or love to describe a stone. If one speaks of a thought as weighty, he is not referring to pounds or ounces. The realms of matter and mind, of nature and of grace, of necessity and freedom, of sense and spirit are thus wholly separate in thought, but it is mind that perceives matter, and therefore we have a right to assert the psychological primacy of the soul over the body. Every man may claim, "*I am a soul and I have a body.*"

Behind all these dual phenomena is the unity of consciousness. Man constantly claims, "I see, I hear, I smell, I taste, I touch," and more than that, "I think, I feel, I love, I wish, I will." Material things, which possess no such unity, constantly are changing, dissolving, and being shaped into new forms. But when all experiences meet in the "I" we find a unity which is necessarily indissoluble. Personality is the plank on which the soul escapes the shipwreck of matter.

This unity of selfhood stands out also in personal identity. "I" am the same, despite all change, in the midst of all material

alterations. Sixty years ago, a boy with tattered hat and bare legs stood rolling a pine log with his feet in a Wisconsin river; to-day, five times as old in years and twice as heavy in weight, wearing dress suits or reading philosophy, he still knows that the boy and he are one in personality. The stream of life flows by and still "I" am here. Memory with her hoarded treasures, thought with her ideal possessions, imagination with her pictures, hope with her prophecies—all meet and abide in the Ego. While matter dissolves and the body constantly changes, the personality persists, and no material dissolution, not even death, can obliterate the immortal soul.

This leads immediately to what may be termed the *teleological* argument, one based on what is called purpose, or final cause. Human life has functions which transcend all material and temporal ends.

Doubtless it is this element in the character of man which has created that not universal but quite common belief in immortality. It is indeed not strange that the barrel-organ called man should end nearly all the tunes of life with the strain of immortality. Human desires and instincts at their best have always felt this urge toward eternity. Probably no young wild goose has ever ventured to refuse to follow his captain gander as winter brings the instinct to fly south toward a summer home. And it is better even for the mechanistic behaviorists to honor the imaginative instincts of those richer souls who possess "bright shoots of everlastingness." Those to whom that much-meaning word "value" has grown until they feel the worth of the soul, will sing as Milton does concerning Lycidas, that "Death, the evening star of memory, is the morning star of hope."

Human capabilities are not exhausted by this earthly life of ours. If death ends all, then there is something in human nature which is a failure and all the splendor of its limited achievement would be but a magnificent sepulcher and all the banners of beauty that man wears but the ornament of a grave. The vessel of life does not fill its cargo here. Life apparently fulfills the destiny of the plant and the animal but not of man. The tree and the tiger, the lily and the lion achieve a certain completion of destiny but this

is not true of man. He "looks before and after." The creative character of humanity knows no personal consummation. Man stands forever on the edge of the world endeavoring to invade and overcome all time and space. In his arts, his culture, his science, by cunning inventions and creative beauty, he wars against nature and against time. It would be foolish to absolutely deny a future to beasts, but they cannot claim this purposeful evidence of immortality found in the nature of man.

Human affections are infected with this immortal element. All the world of love grows this pathetic race of forgetmenots; shall not heaven pluck and wear them forever on her bosom. There are striking differences between man and beast with reference to death. Beasts make no preparation, build no monuments, celebrate no obsequies. It is lovely to read the nonsense verse which pictures them assembled to investigate "Who killed Cock Robin?" but they keep on their killing without using liturgies or holding funerals. Man makes of his own death a triumph, for he feels himself greater than death. It is not by slaying others but by dying for them that he manifests his real majesty.

Nearly forty years ago in the bay of Apia, one of the Samoan islands, a terrific cyclone wrought a historic tragedy. An American naval vessel whose engines were not strong enough to stand the gale was swiftly urged toward the island, while an English ship with a like load of marines had just enough power in its machinery to slowly make out to sea and safety. As the two cruisers passed each other the British looked with fraternal sympathy on the other deck filled with American sailors and soldiers. But the latter as she beheld the triumph of their successful neighbors, cheered them for their victory over the storm, raised the Stars and Stripes while their band played the Star Spangled Banner. Thus shouting a farewell of honor to their friend, they swept toward the rocky reef, where they all went down, their stainless flag flying over them as they sank. Which ship sailed toward death and which toward life? Both toward life! for both alike possessed something in their souls which could never be buried either in the earth or the sea!

Above all these partial proofs of immortality is the *ethical*

argument, based upon what Kant calls "the categorical imperative of consciousness."

There are moral contradictions in life which would justify pessimistic despair if there were no eternity to make right the wrongs of time. Man's brief career here on earth is an unsolved problem, a moral puzzle. How often when we have read fiction in the serial form, have we been shocked as an article ended with a horrible situation in which a noble hero or heroine were seemingly doomed to brutal or destructive injury. What hope it raised when at the end of that fragment of fiction we could see the words "To be continued." Our moral sense of justice and its claims on all life is an assurance that this contradictory life of ours is to be continued. Death is not the worst of outrages but a glorious chance of a coming righteousness which shall revenge the cruelties and wrongs of life and vindicate moral character.

Immortality is an implication of conscience. Such words as "ought" are testimonies of an unseen throne of justice. Conscience gives to moral law an infinite character which requires for the soul of man an eternal life.

Reason and Immortality—are these proofs, psychological, teleological and ethical, more than mere shadows cast upon our souls from the unseen world? What of it? It was led by a shadow that Magellan, four hundred years ago, followed the sunset around the world and overtook the dawn. Back of all these propositions, which are only minor in their character, is the Divine Revelation in Jesus Christ, which linked to these lesser truths gives logical proof of Eternal Life.

In varied forms there has reached us that mythical story of Edwin, the Saxon king, as he feasted with his lords. Within, the hall was lighted with many candles and lamps; outside, the night was dark as death and storms beat the palace walls and windows. Near the royal master and arguing with him was a saintly missionary from the Christian world. While talking a bird flew into the room, darted for moments in its brightness above all their heads, and then passed out again into the black night. Said the pagan prince to the messenger of Christ: "That bird is like my own life. I do not know whence it came or whither it goes." "Yes, yes, you

do know," said the missionary. "The bird came from and returned to its nest and home." Does not everyone have knowledge enough to feel that eternity is the stuff of which our love, flying onward, builds its cooing nests under the eaves of the universe?

DIVIDING THE GARMENTS

EVERYTHING in the life and death of Jesus is of universal significance. As the shepherds and wise men who came to his manger were but the forerunners of a mightier host of worshipers, so do those gathered about his cross represent a universe of sinning souls. The Crucifixion was only an outward representation of what goes on eternally in the relations of God and man. The Lamb was slain from the foundations of the world, and the slain Lamb is beside the everlasting throne until its consummation. The heart of Christ is the center of the universe.

That most heartless element in the story of Calvary, the dividing of the garments of Jesus among the thoughtless four soldiers who guarded the Cross, is a type of what goes on continually in the attitude of an indifferent world to Christ. They care more for his garments than they do for him.

What are his garments? Literally there were at least two, an outer and inner robe, the toga and the tunic. The first made up of four or more fragments, was ripped apart and divided among those soldiers; the second was a seamless robe and was parted by lot. These were perquisites of the executioners. But figuratively we may call all the outward forms taken by the Divine thought the garments of the Christ.

Nature is an outward clothing of Deity. The Scriptures ascribe creation to the Second Person of the Holy Trinity. It is an external manifestation of the Eternal Word. John says: "By him the worlds were made." And Paul teaches: "By him were all things created, visible and invisible, whether they be things in heaven or in the earth; . . . and he is before all things and by him all things consist." His power moved the loom by which were woven the curtains of the sky, the carpets of the earth, the robes of the forest. All things in nature are but foam bills along the

causing stream of his thought, spray flung up from the infinite ocean of his being. Goethe well calls nature "the living visible garment of God." And while humanity largely rejects God, yet this garment of his has always been greedily divided among the thankless children of men. They bask in the beauty of his sunshine and are refreshed by his blessing of rain; they part among themselves his heritage of fertile fields and gamble for the treasures hidden in his mines of wealth, while they forget or defy the Living One who dwells beneath and behind all that appears. They enjoy the gifts and crucify the Giver.

Redemption is an inner robe of God. Christ is immanent in his church. "It is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." "He hath ascended up, far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." The true Holy Church is the continuous coming of Christ into the conditions of human society, into the spirit and order of things, so that all in life becomes a sacrament of his presence. The material creation is the robe of his power, but this new creation is the vesture of his love. Every external condition of spiritual morality that manifests an inward Christ may be taken as his garments. They are the outward apparel which he wears in the world. And these are often prized while he is rejected.

Those Roman soldiers symbolize the unbelieving world. All those whose sin was a first cause of his death share in many of his gifts. There were four soldiers and we may picture the four fragments of his outer robe as follows:

One historic gift of Jesus Christ is human freedom. He made a great contribution to political science in his practical recognition of all men as brethren. Before Christ there were no real republics. Those so styled in Greece and Rome were not genuine democracies but oligarchies. The whole theory of human rights lies hid in the gospel of love and the doctrine of salvation by faith. Men are not so much equal as the creation of one God as the brethren of one Christ. By the incarnation and atonement he testified to the royalty of human nature, and in the sign of the Cross every man may boldly take his crown of personal sovereignty in the presence of the universe. In Christ all distinctions—bond, free, race, color, sex, etc.—are swallowed up in the greater conception, Man. He

has entered national life and introduced what was unknown before, a national conscience. As Guizot said: "He has taught repentance to the nations." Humanity has made much of this thought and all Christendom, yes, and all the world, is beginning to rejoice in civil liberty. Yet, is Christ crucified by the nations? Yes, in the person of the poor, in the prejudice of race and in the building of social caste. The council chambers of kings, the cabinets of presidents, the parliaments and congresses, are often but judgment halls of Pilate where he is mocked and condemned. Humanity grasps the liberty and kills the Liberator.

A second part of his outer robe is material prosperity. Jesus was the founder of a new civilization. By the broadening of men's thoughts and the harmonizing of human interests, he gave a new spur to the world's industrial and commercial activity. Agriculture, manufactures, commerce—all have a meaning under Christian civilization which they have nowhere else. The spirit that has subdued the prairies, conquered the forests, fertilized the deserts, harnessed the streams and controlled the lightning was inspired by the Christ. This fragment of his clothing is most highly prized by the world of to-day. All would share its benefits, but he is being crucified, on the farm, in the shop, the counting house and the factory. With worse than Judas-treachery, he is still sold in the market places of the earth.

Another portion of that outer garment of our Lord is culture, including literature and art. He dwells in all the forms of beauty which truly delight men and in all the forces of truth which make men strong. Literature should be a polyglot gospel of Christ, for he has enfranchised it and made it a human institution. There was, indeed, before his coming a classic art, which in its way can never be excelled. It reached the perfection of beauty both in form and color. But Christian art has struck a higher note. It has disclosed the Christ ideal of spiritual beauty. The Romance art, that glory of the modern spirit, reveals the thought, the ideal, breaking through and mastering the material. Music, the most subjective and therefore possibly the most spiritual of all arts, in its present form is quite wholly the product of Christian centuries. This garment of beauty is his own. And men have greedily seized

it and in possessing it they are justly proud. They pluck these roses of art, but leave the thorns to tear his brow.

A fourth fragment of the robe of Christ is scientific knowledge. "In him are hid all treasures of wisdom and knowledge." The grand conception of the unity of all law, which is the key to science, is nowhere so clearly seen as in him. Thus we dare to claim that the cosmical conception springs from him. Seen in Christ, as did John in his Prologue, and Paul in his theology, nature becomes something intelligible. He reveals a providential order in history and a pervading beneficial order in nature. Neither Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of Rome* nor Darwin's *Origin of Species*, in spite of those elements in them which many may question, could have been written without the influence of Jesus on human thought. Philosophy becomes lustrous and science a divine reality seen through him. Although "the heavens declare the glory of God," the knowledge of the glory is "in the face of Jesus Christ." This part of his raiment is claimed to-day as one of the most priceless adornments of humanity, yet its owner is still being crucified in human thought and selfish hands seize upon his robes beneath the very dripping blood of Calvary. Every geologic mountain becomes a new Golgotha on which he writhes in agony.

Greatest of all is that seamless robe, which worn next his person may well represent the spiritual ethics of Jesus Christ. Perhaps his best gift to the world is his sinless example. It is without seam, woven in no human loom; it is the work only of a Divine hand. This fair vesture of his purity is passing over to humanity. The lives of nearly all men are better because of his life, yet in the name of the very morals of Christianity many deny the Lord; because of a goodness derived from him alone, men disdain their need of his Person. We have beheld the many-hued glory of a cathedral window fall upon the floor in splendid pictures of color, but, when the glory passed, nothing was left but the stained and unclean pavement. So is the self-righteousness of moral man nothing but the reflected light of Christian excellencies. Behind the shield of Christian virtues which the world boasts as its own arrows are cast at the Master. Worst of all, his garments

are made the pretext and means of crucifying him. With the price of his raiment are bought the nails for his piercing!

Are not we to blame as well as those ignorant soldiers who simply carried out the orders of Jewish Sanhedrin and Roman Judge? It is wrong to charge the Jews alone with his condemnation and crucifixion. In the crowd of his destroyers are not merely that once chosen people of God but frequently that body of his own called the Church of God. There is much practical indifference among those who claim to love him; it is our own infidelity to duty which is the deepest wound that tears the tender flesh of Christ. His church, as well as the world, too often prefers his garments to himself. Christ is more than creed, more than ordinance or institution; these are but his garments. Many take these things for essential Christianity and enjoy the privilege of church membership and of the church itself and forget the Living One who dwells in these things. Christ and nothing else makes for Christianity.

All must have some share in this dividing of garments. All of us need that inner robe of holiness, but may be compelled to dispense with many or even all those outer garments of precious earthly gifts. The Christian life often involves renunciation. Perhaps that future life called heaven is built of the ruins of this world. Its walls are built of gems, but mayhap they were flung from jeweled hands here below. That its banks of beauty may bloom with flowers, earth's blossoms must fade and die; heaven's music may be born of the silencing of earthly song; its glory shines afar with light from the fallen stars of human hope and the dying suns of earthly joys; its love is enriched by the self-denials of earth.

Not far from that Cross of Calvary holy women stood. They were thinking not of his robes but of him. Doubtless they may have made the very garments those soldiers are ripping apart and for which they are gambling. So should we all, in all our vocations, not clothe ourselves with luxury, but weave new vestures for our Lord. If in science, art or trade we glorify him alone, then there is healing in the touch of the garments he wears. Life's highest meaning is Christ. So let the mighty tide of human love

carry its swelling crest of all earth's riches, which are his and not our own, to break in spray of offered services at his feet! He really keeps nothing for himself, but will spend the pomp and splendor of the universe to deck a ransomed soul. Shall anyone be poor who gives up all to Christ? No, for to those who trust and love him is the promise: "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's."

Dividing the garments implied either ignorance or unbelief as to his resurrection. He will not need them again! If they could have really believed in a coming Christ Jesus, who might require the return of his robes, they could not so thoughtlessly and ungratefully seize and enjoy them. That is the last word of a merely mundane culture to-day. Even Matthew Arnold, whose fine culture came to him along the line of a Christian heritage, has dared to write:

But he is dead; afar he lies
In a lone Syrian town;
And on his grave with shining eyes
The Syrian stars look down.

Is it because you think him dead, you skeptics, that you dare flout his robes of beauty and power as your own? "He is not dead, he is risen." Jesus Christ lives to-day and has the right to demand his garments from the robbers of the Cross. Give him back his own! His enemies may still see him on the Cross, the indifferent may still think of him in Joseph's tomb, but his friends who prize him, rather than all others, saw him on Easter morn, on the Mount of Ascension, on the footsteps of the throne—a Living Christ.

Fade, fade, each earthly joy.
Jesus is mine.

Yea, thee alone, O Christ, here and in all the realms of infinity, now and in all the ages of Eternity, none but Jesus!

SAMUEL, PATRIOT AND PROPHET

RAMAH, the birthplace of Samuel, where he spent many years of his life, is probably a village about nine miles north from Jerusalem. Shiloh, the sanctuary, where his mother prayed for his

coming, and where several years of his boyhood were passed, was in central Canaan, near the road from Bethel to Shechem. Mizpah, where he ruled as civic judge, was either what is now known as *Nebi Samil* or some point on the high ridge north of *Shafat*, whose watchtower is not far from Jerusalem but visible from Mount Ebal in the north. Gilgal, closely associated with his name, was an ancient shrine near Jericho and the Jordan. But his fame filled the land from Dan to Beersheba.

With Samuel we begin to be rather more sure of our biblical dates. Assyrian calendars help us to fix the death of Saul and accession of David at 1017 B. C. In round numbers, Samuel was born about 1080 B. C., judged Israel 1060-1040 B. C., and died about 1020 B. C. The Philistines (whose name is identical with Palestine) were probably a European people, either Pelasgic or Hellenic, who seem, however, on their conquest of Syrian soil to have absorbed many Semitic customs. Their invading forces, which came most largely, it is now thought, from the isle of Crete, disturbed all Western Asia and even Egypt, on whose monuments they are called the *Purusata*. Highly horrible was the partial bondage of Israel to Philistia.

What Lincoln was to America Samuel was to Israel. The last of the judges, he is the only judge of the justice of whose administration we have any glimpse. The others were soldiers, heroes of a fighting age. He was a righteous ruler and a spiritual statesman. Moses had brought a nation to birth; but it was still a loosely knit body of tribes. Samuel cemented these scattered fragments into a unified nation, which made a monarchy possible. He was a man with a holy passion; but also one with an efficient program. He furnishes us a fine picture of the true patriot.

1. *He was a patriot by birth.* Right generation is an aid to regeneration. If a man is born right to begin with, it is not half so hard to be born again. Samuel came as a gift to the pious Hannah in answer to her prayers. Her song of rejoicing at his birth is a passionate pæan of patriotic devotion, a prelude to the *Magnificat* of the Virgin Mother of our Lord, an ode of theocratic democracy. Samuel therefore had a holy heredity, born out of an

intense devotion to Hebrew history and of faith in Jehovah. He was born of a peasant father and a pious mother. The eugenic background of his life forms a fine physical and spiritual basis for his personality. A better parenthood would give us a better citizenry.

2. *Samuel was a patriot by training.* Ten or twelve years of his boyhood were spent in the sanctuary at Shiloh under the care and tutorship of Eli, who was the inefficient judge of Israel; a weak man but a kind and good one. Perhaps environment plays a bigger part in the making of manhood than even heredity. A child born in the slums may become a saint if transplanted to a religious atmosphere. A distinguished sociologist said recently, "If brought up in a good environment I would rather be the son of a healthy burglar than of a consumptive bishop!" Children should grow up in the church. It is a shame to keep only older sheep in the fold and let the lambs be lost in the wilderness.

And then, at the shrine of Jehovah, came Samuel's call to higher service. His lifework was initiated by a Voice out of the unseen. It was a time of withheld light to his nation. As he told them in his address toward the close of his life, they had forgotten God. *Sin shuts the eyes of the soul and deadens its hearing.* One child had the spiritual receptivity which could bring God back to his people. "Speak, Jehovah; for thy servant heareth"—so he cries, and God becomes a living Presence in his life and, through his message, to all Israel. True patriotism is not only born but also brought up in the church.

3. *The prophet is the supreme patriotic leader.* All the prophets of Israel were pious politicians and spiritual statesmen. Their message was more frequently to society than to the individual. They were heralds of national unity, advisers to kings, and defenders of the people. Samuel stands as the first in a long succession of these spokesmen for God. But introducing religion into politics, which is the prophetic function, does not mean ruling men by ecclesiasticism. Samuel was a priest as well as a prophet, but not by priesthood did he rule his people. Long before Amos and Hosea he proclaimed this great truth: "To obey is bet-

ter than sacrifice." Religion must rule the state not by ritual but by righteousness.

4. *As a true patriot he was an efficient public official.* In his famous apology (1 Sam. 12) he protested his official integrity, denying dishonesty, bribery, and self-interest. And the elders agreed. Loyalty to God helps fidelity to man. With an absolutely clear conscience Samuel could claim a clean record.

5. *Samuel employed a dual program of patriotism.* He established schools of the prophets in which young men were taught holy history and sacred psalmody. Reading and writing were adorned with music, and all was inspired by worship. Near his home at Ramah many youths were gathered in Naioth (which means "student lodgings"). Later David found fellowship in these educational centers, and Elijah restored them for the salvation of the northern kingdom. *Only trained men can render worthy leadership to the world.* Lack of knowledge has often destroyed a people. This man who discovered and helped in the training of David has furnished us a real method of civic construction and reconstruction.

But culture was not his only instrument of social salvation. Samuel was a man of prayer. The real reformers of the world are not the soldier and the diplomat. Samuel wore no armor and carried no sword. *The two weapons of his warfare were instruction and intercession.* Hear his great text (for all preachers to use) on intercessory prayer: "Far be it from me that I should sin against Jehovah in ceasing to pray for you" (1 Sam. 12. 23). Such has been the spirit of all the masters of human history. Moses cried, "Forgive their sin; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book" (Exod. 32. 32). And to-day we can win Jesus Christ's scepter of power only by sharing his sacrifice and his intercession. When all else has been tried and has failed, prayer remains. Is not prayer a lost secret in the church of to-day?

6. *Samuel, as a true patriot, became a national deliverer.* He came to leadership at the moment of Israel's deepest disgrace, pictured by the psalmist as a climax of corruption. When Jeremiah recalled it as a warning, it aroused a recreant crowd to fury. The

tempest of divine vengeance fell on Israel. *Ichabod* ("The glory is departed") is the sad inscription on the record of the times. Yet the Philistines did not win, and God's people were not defeated; for the prayers of Samuel and the penitence of the people turned defeat into triumph. On a monument was written a new motto: *Ebenezer* ("A witness of Jehovah's help"). Not by might nor by power but by spiritual awakening does real deliverance come.

The world needs a Moses or a Samuel at this hour of peril. Yes, and America needs him too—the true patriot with the prophetic vision that discloses all duties and unites vision with service. May God give him to us and to the world!

THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER

IN this issue we are presenting two textual topical outlines for sermons adapted to this season of the Christian year, in which come both Good Friday and Easter Day.

THE SECOND WORD OF THE CROSS—Luke 23. 39-43

Jesus spoke the First Word as a Priest, but the Second Word as a King. It is a jewel in the jet setting of the Passion drama, only told in Luke, that Gospel of abounding mercy. In the moment of supreme agony, Jesus was still the wonder worker. His parched lips still have the power of command and his pierced hands still sway the scepter of mercy. The dying shoulders are able to carry this lost sheep, the penitent thief, safe through the gateway of death into his heavenly sheepfold. The sinful thief said "Save me," the Holy Lord said "Remember me."

I. *The Criminal's Confession.* He was more than a mean, low, vulgar malefactor with a nut shell mind and a foul tongue. His hands and feet are bound but his heart and tongue are free. His heart believes and his tongue confesses. (Did some old innocent memories mingle with his prayer?)

Confession of Sin. Penitence is the prime condition of mercy. This man saw his sin in the light of Christ's sinlessness and owned the justice of his own condemnation. As long as we justify ourselves, palliate our offenses, make excuses for our faults, we keep ourselves outside his grace.

Profession of Faith. Faith is easy when contrition is well done; we get on "believing ground." If we find it hard to believe, it is because we have failed to surrender. But this man's faith is remarkable in that he can see the King in the victim. The disciples forsake and flee; the women are weeping, the mob is raging, and in the midst of derision and contempt of the crowd, one voice says "Lord." Others see the thorny wreath,

he beholds the crown of glory; others hear the insults of the mob, he hears the acclamations of angels and the harps of heaven. He has the vision that rejects the triumphant wrong and sees the royalty of the crucified right. Faith is just this spiritual and ethical insight, this confidence in the essential lordship of righteousness and consequent submission to it. Is this Suffering Saviour a King? Do we need to see some label to recognize his greatness?

The thief had heard the prayer, "Father, forgive them," and was not afraid to throw himself on the breath of that petition, trusting that it would sustain him in the deepest darkness of death. What would a pardon from Herod or Pilate be beside an acceptance at the hands of this King? In the message of Jesus this man breathes eternity.

II. *The Saviour's Response.* Surely our Lord did find some comfort in this one note of sympathy amid the unlovely chimes of mockery and insult. It was like a song in the night. In the garden an angel had ministered to him, but on the Cross he had something better. He had a foretaste of his coming triumph in a human voice and a human faith.

The Assurance. "Verily"—He speaks with authority. He is not the philosopher to say "I think," the logician to say "I conclude," the scholar to say "I read"; He is the God-man who can speak certainty to our hearts: "Amen, I say unto you."

The Promise. "To-day"—salvation may be, must be now. That very evening this penitent thief will be walking whiterobed beside his Lord. The best road to heaven is not a future probation which leads round about through hell, but a path straight to God by the way of the Cross. Millennialists too often confine their hope in Jesus to "when thou comest," and look afar for the splendor of the starry pathway, but Christ says "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Paradise was lost by Adam, but now the blazing swords that barred its gate are quenched in the atoning Blood. Earth is nearer heaven than we think. The Cross of Christ is its true Tree of Life. "With Me," he said, for it is Christ makes heaven. Listen to these lovely words of Augustine: "To-day, what speed! in Paradise, what rest! with Me, what companionship!"

The Revelation. Jesus gives a glimpse of the invisible world, and shows us the Cross as the gateway to Paradise. It is the true magnet that draws souls, the real index and prophecy of the Kingdom, the open door to Heaven. His pierced hands can turn the Key that unlocks that Door.

Here is a beacon of hope to the worst of sinners:

"There may I, though vile as he,
Wash all my sins away."

But there is a warning in this story; there is only this single death-bed repentance recorded in the Bible. "One that none might despair, and only one, that no one might presume." Remember there was another cross on the other side of Jesus where hung an unrepentant thief. Do not risk the peril of being at last on the wrong side of the Cross. All

ministerial experience is against the value of sick-bed repentance. The work of the Church is not to send forth thieves, however contrite, but to create saints, however imperfect.

That day heaven opened on the first born of the redeemed, the first trophy of the Cross. Imagine their entry into Paradise. Hush, harp of Gabriel, songs of seraphs and of the morning stars, a new song is heard for the first time in heaven. "Unto Him that hath loved us."

"Thou a sinful woman savedst,
Thou the dying thief forgavest,
And to me a hope vouchsafest."

Jesus Christ is repeating that Second Word every day to those who pass from death into life, to be "absent from the body and present with the Lord."

OUR EVER-LIVING LORD

Fear not: I am the first and the last and the Living One: and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore, and I have the Keys of death and of Hades. Rev. 1. 17, 18.

The seraphic heralds of the Advent sang "Fear not" and it is also the greeting of the glorified Lord. So sing also the angels of the resurrection. Yet this as John describes it is a vision of dread magnificence, a sudden rush of awful glory into his exiled life. The sudden peal of a trumpet voice, the eyes of flame blazing from a radiant face and a voice like rushing rivers and thundering cataracts. John needed the comforting assurance to feel again the human touch as he had felt it sixty years before when he lay on the bosom of the One now glorified. "I am your very friend of former time, the changeless friend, and I have taken up that earthly experience of life and death into eternal life." The resurrection of Christ makes of the Incarnation an eternal fact.

1. *The Eternal One.* "I am the First and the Last." Who is Jesus of Nazareth? John answers that he is the Eternal Word made flesh in time. He is First. Before the light of stars burned holes in the darkness of chaos, before any angel awoke the silence of eternity with a song, He *was* and they shine with a borrowed splendor. He is Last. His priesthood has the power of an endless life. One cannot be healed by a surgeon who lived a hundred years ago. He is the Living One. "I am the Life." To lose the Living Christ is to lose the Living God. He lives and that is enough, a living faith is faith in a Living Lord.

2. *He retains His earthly experience.* It is "the very same Jesus." This is the profoundest truth and the supreme value of the resurrection of Christ. It gives eternal significance to the earthly human life of our Lord. Just as by the Incarnation the life of the Eternal Word overflowed into time, so by his glorious Resurrection, the Cross has overflowed into eternity. Christmas and Easter symbolize the same truth. And Christ has not forgotten Calvary. "I was dead." He cannot forget the quivering flesh nor how he staggered under the burden of a world's sorrow and sin. He still cries to the doubter: "Behold my hands and my side,"

and in the midst of the radiance of the everlasting throne, faith sees exalted "a Lamb as it had been slain."

3. *He is the Lord of all worlds.* He holds the Keys, all doors stand open to him, and he passes freely between the seen and the unseen.

Although Jesus Christ is the Eternal One, his title to royalty rests on conquest; it is written with the blood of the Cross and we read it by the light of the resurrection. Not merely by creation, but by redemption has he won his crown. It rests on service and sacrifice.

He has passed through all realms and owns them all. Paul thus teaches the ubiquity of the risen and glorified body of our Lord: "That he might fill all things." He has broken down all barriers and commands all the gateways of nature and life. Supreme Master in the household of Being, he carries the Keys.

4. *He has abolished death.* "I am alive forevermore." Others, like Lazarus, had arisen only to return again into the shadows of the tomb and the decay of the charnel house. Jesus had his sleep out. No manacle of the Great Destroyer clings to the wrist that shattered the stony gateway of Joseph's tomb and let the light of eternity into the darkness of death.

The Living One, he did not have to die, and once was enough! The Church marches in no funeral procession, with wailing dirges and mournful coronach, but in the train of the Prince of life, the deathless One, with pæans of victory. "Who telleth the tale of unspeaking death?" He alone has the Key. Do we wish an assurance of immortality? No fraudulent medium or self hypnotized neurotic has the right to speak. His voice alone breaks the silence of the sepulchre with his glad "All hail!" From his glowing garments a path of beams shines through the gloom of the grave.

He is Lord of the vast empire of death, and has annexed it to his Kingdom of life. Death reigns no longer, save as his viceroy. As guardian of the gate he keeps it for his own. Its portals are not blown open by the breath of Chance, but only as he turns the key to make a pathway for his beloved.

Some of us will go this Easter Sunday and lay the lilies of the resurrection above the bosom of our dead. Can we dedicate the unknown and the inevitable? Yes, even the dust has become sacred by his consecration. It stirs beneath his touch and thrills at his advancing footsteps.

He is also Lord of the spirit world, he has the Key of Hades. Vaster than the visible, circling outside the firmament that holds the sun and stars, is his unseen world of spirits. He shall one day open its doors that its unseen millions may again take body and form. "I believe in the resurrection of the body." Sing the Te Deum: "When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death, thou didst open the Kingdom of heaven to all believers."

When did John have this vision? It was on the Lord's Day (Rev. 1. 10), which is an Easter day in every week. May we too on this holy day not feel the swelling tides of the Spirit and hear the mighty voice that forbids our fear?

THE ARENA**RESURRECTION**

THE resurrection is the sweetest and most comforting of Christian mysteries; the basis and the crowning of our faith. Saint Paul justly saw in it the foundation of the whole structure of our religion. To those of Corinth he says: "Some of you say that Christ is not risen, but if Christ is not risen, we shall also not rise; then our faith is vain, and we shall be the most miserable of men, because victims of the saddest illusion."

Let us think: In the life we are living we find ourselves caught between two laws, closed in between two kingdoms; the law of the spirit and the law of flesh, the kingdom of good and the kingdom of evil, which bitterly and dramatically contend for the possession of our being.

In this struggle in us and outside, in every moment of our existence, whether sleeping or watching, which sometimes assumes such tragical situations, we cannot remain simple spectators. We have to take our share in it, even against our own will: we must draw up in the line of battle either for the one or the other parts contending, which are irreconcilable. Both ask from us a sacrifice and promise us a premium. The law of flesh and evil asks for the sacrifice of the spirit, the renouncement of the rights of the soul, the complete submission of the spirit to the body, and in exchange promises us the possessions of the present and the kind of happiness which consists in the exclusive enjoyment of material goods without any anxiety whatever, in the satisfaction of all our passions and lusts, a happiness which may be more or less long, more or less complete, but which will always be the only and concrete happiness allowed to man to taste. Because for the law of the flesh there is no other life beyond this one. "*Post mortem nulla voluptas*," there is no after death, is the last word of pagan wisdom. If this were true, it would be madness to renounce to the present, to the joy of sin and evil, the only real joy of our tormented existence.

The law of the spirit tells us no; that here is not the end of all, that nothing ends here, and that those are mad who reduce life to material life, the life of the flesh; that the joy of sin is only a bitter and brief joy of the diseased who have lost the sense of healthy pleasure; that true life is the life of spirit, which has no limits, because it is outside space and time; that it begins here with the struggle against passions, and with the slow and gradual affirmation of good on evil, of God's Kingdom on Satan's kingdom, and ends with the resurrection which is the full and absolute sovereignty of the spirit on all the inferior powers of the flesh.

Through resurrection the human being is transformed, the dualism ceases between body and soul, that become one, sharing the same gifts and the same qualities. With resurrection a new life begins; a life of action, of work, of struggle, but deprived of the sufferings which arise from the contrast between our will and our power, between truth

and error, between the aspirations to the good and the sinking into evil, between dream and reality, between knowledge and ignorance.

This is true life, tells us the spiritual law in us, to be acquired only when renouncing the false life of the flesh and of sin.

Now, says Saint Paul, for the only fact of being Christians, we have chosen to struggle for the victory of the law of the spirit over the law of the body, to kill the old man in view and in the hope of resurrection that shall bring us in possession of true life. But if this does not exist? If it is only an illusion of our imagination, if it is only the produce of that sacred disease called faith? We would then be really foolish if for a dream of our diseased mind, we renounce the only reality, the only joy of life: the flesh, the sin.

But resurrection there is, and it is unfailing, because it is the fruit of the fundamental law of the Kingdom of God, of spiritual evolution. This law is truer than any physical law. It has been revealed to us by Christ, it has been for the first time actuated in Him, and it will fatally actuate in all those who will follow in His steps.

For this the resurrection of Christ has not only a divine value, but also a deep human significance, as all the mysteries of His life, in which we must not only believe, we must make them revive in us.

Well, what is this resurrection? Is it the divine or the human which resuscitates in Him? Certainly not Divinity, which never died, and could not resuscitate. It is then the human element. But was the human nature of Jesus quite the same as ours? Yes, certainly, because it is this human nature that had to be redeemed. From the day He assumed this sorrowful humanity, the tragical struggle between the law of the spirit and the law of the flesh began also in Him. He experienced all the assaults and deceits, He experienced hunger, thirst, fatigue, physical pain, poverty, misery; He was tempted by all the powers of evil: ambition, pride, vanity, egotism, etc. All the terrors assailed Him, the terror of things and the terror of men. Nothing could conquer Him. He knew how to conquer them one by one and subdue them and crucify them to the law of the spirit. Until at the last day, and last hour of his earthly life, on the cross, assailed by the last fear, the last horror—the fear of being forsaken by His Father, the horror of death—having overcome both, He completely overpowered and subdued the flesh to the conquering spirit. The struggle was at an end. That poor bleeding, suffering humanity wanted just a brief hour of rest, the rest of the tomb, to initiate the new phase of His life, transfigured by the triumph of the law of the spirit. For a brief hour it rested in the tomb, and from there it rose, free, intangible, luminous as the spirit.

This is also our resurrection. The apostle teaches us how we can realize it. We must die every day with Christ to resuscitate in Him.

The life of the righteous is nothing but a continuous death, a continuous agony, illumined by the firm hope of the final and total resurrection awaiting him.

FULVIO TRALASCIA.

Rome, Italy.

"I AM THE CAPTAIN OF MY SOUL"

It would be a task worthy of Stuart Chase or any other eminent statistician to discover how many thousands of times within the last few years these brave words of Henley have been cited approvingly, even enthusiastically, by religious leaders, as though they embody an ideal Christian spirit. Within the brief span of a month I have heard them chanted in chapel, declaimed by a devout college president, intoned by a minister in a sermon on Christian faith and by a United States senator in a great Methodist Men's Council.

"Out of the Night that covers me,
Black as the Pit from Pole to Pole,
I thank whatever gods there be
For my unconquerable Soul."

These are great words, ringing words. They conform to Coleridge's fine description of poetry, "the best words in the best order." I love them as much as those who love them most. But they are not Christian. They go back in their spiritual ancestry into the fogs of England or the land of Beowulf long before Augustine brought the message of personal immortality—and trust in a heavenly Father. Said Beowulf on the eve of his fight with the Water Witch, "Wyrd oftentimes spareth a fated earl, if his courage holds." If Henley had been in Heorot on that night in the fifth century, the meeting would not have broken up until they had sung with fine gusto:

"I thank whatever gods there be
For my unconquerable Soul."

However, every time I hear them injected into an orthodox Christian discourse I wonder anew at the marvels of il-logic that can fit them into a sermon preceded by the Lord's Prayer and followed by

"Sun of my soul, thou Saviour dear,
It is not night if thou art near."

Every other phrase in the poem exudes the same bleak, stark Anglo-Saxon agnosticism as well as the racial courage that holds on "when there is nothing in him, except the will which says to him, 'Hold on.'"

"Whatever gods there be"

(But there are no gods, he means.)

"In the fell clutch of circumstance"

(Where is the divine uplifting hand?)

"Under the bludgeonings of Chance"

(Not providence!)

"I have not winced nor cried aloud"

(No hint here that "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.")

"It matters not how strait the gate,
How carved with punishment the scroll."

(No suggestion of repentance in the hope of having sins red as scarlet washed white as snow.)

"I am the Master of my Fate,
I am the Captain of my Soul."

It seems to me that a mistake the orthodox follower of Christian tradition makes too often is to capture any worthy sentiment or belief that exists or has ever existed, and affix it to the tail of the Christian comet. The modernist, intent on "saving" the church from the dangers that beset it, is perhaps the worst offender. He will make a complete list of all the virtues and ideals which to our age seem worthy, and calmly announce that the total is Christianity. He will go into the fogs of the nineteenth century for that magnificent creed of the honest doubter, Arthur Hugh Clough:

"It fortifies my soul to know
That though I perish,
Truth is so;
I steadier step when I recall
That though I slip,
Thou dost not fall."

And without blushing he will identify "thou" in the last line, with the Christian God, although it manifestly refers to Truth. He will with the best intentions wrench history to bring Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius into the arc—or into the ark. He will even commit the absurdity of making Lao-tzu, five hundred years before Christ, a plagiarist when he said, "To the good I show virtue; to the evil I also show virtue, for Virtue is good." He needs a lesson from modern realism to teach him that claiming everything is likely to lose him everything.

Christian faith is built upon heroic stones in human nature. The essence of it is *love*. In the sophisticated Chinese of the sixth century B. C. was a serene perception of the virtue of virtue; it was not Christian. In the Greek Stoic was the hard endurance of him who said:

"Your ship is lost. What has happened? Your ship is lost.
Nothing more? Nothing! Your son is dead. What has happened?
Your son is dead. Nothing more? Nothing!"

In the savage of north Europe was a furious individualism which still erupts in the nineteenth century in words that stir everyone who hides close under his skin the same feeling that he is alone in the universe, and not afraid:

"I am the Master of my Fate."

Christianity was none of these; it was love. A Christian is blind who claims them; insensitive to the contributions of other cultures and other teachers; but stone-blind to the light in his faith. That light which shines in the darkness of a brave but foolish and braggart individualism, is the wisdom of dependence, the gospel of love, the doctrine of mutual aid.

We shall always thrill to the defiance of one who stands alone and glories in his puny strength at hopeless odds with the winds that storm the universe. That way lies heroism. We cannot help the thrill if we would, considering our ancestors. But considering our descendants, we will look about us, and perceiving other men beset by the same puzzlement and chilled by the same isolation, we will draw together, warming and heartening each other with our common lack of heroism. That way lies wisdom!

THOMAS P. BEYER.

Saint Paul, Minn.

BIBLICAL RESEARCH

MODERN LESSONS FROM ANCIENT ISRAELITES

[EDITORIAL PROEM.—Professor Rusk, in the letter accompanying this article, stated thus its educational purpose: "I have long felt that the chief reason why students lose their faith in Christianity as a result of a scientific study of the religion of the Old Testament (which must destroy belief in all supernatural sanctions and even the moral authority of much of the Old Testament) is that the moral and religious meaning of the lives of primitive Israelites is not pointed out to them during the course of their scientific study. A new theological explanation of the lives of the Israelites is not given the students to take the place of the discredited one offered by the writers of the Old Testament books themselves. Therefore the students come away without any intellectual structure for their faith, which soon collapses." He therefore wrote the accompanying lecture for his students at Goucher College to strengthen their faith, and commends it to the attention of other teachers of the Old Testament.]

I wish to speak this morning for ten or fifteen minutes about the lives of the primitive Israelites. We have been accustomed to think of their lives as part of the process of the ages. We may even have realized that however rudimentary may have been their knowledge, how cruel their desires, yet that the progress to which mankind has now attained could not have been attained had it not been for their labors. But to-day I wish to consider two further questions: Have their lives in themselves any permanent moral value? Do they give us any valid insight into the nature of God? I believe that we can answer both questions in the affirmative.

I. Their lives were heroic, for, generally speaking, the conditions under which they lived were hard. The young were ruled by strict adherence to custom by their elders and by the evident conditions of survival. Although they enjoyed periods of wanton idleness and of frenzied excesses, few could follow their personal desires for considerable periods, since food was always scarce and the enemy never completely destroyed. No one could depend on inherited wealth for a whole life of security and

ease. They *had* to be good farmers—doing work on virgin soil which tore even their iron muscles, and good warriors. Nobody ever protected the primitive Israelites from daily toil, sudden treachery, fatiguing campaigns, torture and death. Hegel has characterized civilization as a growth in freedom. We often complain that our purposes lie in defeat, that circumstances bind us. Yet our freedom is incomparably greater than that of primitive man.

How stern were the conditions of their living will be evident if we consider why the men did not always protect the women and children rather than themselves. (1) The men were accustomed to have their women and children taken from them and made slaves or slaughtered whenever a battle was lost. That was what defeat meant. But (2) therefore to die defending them would not protect them. So if defeat were sure they sacrificed some in an effort to save the rest of the community. Now men are not accustomed to see women or children in danger. Therefore it is such a terrible experience that when they do, the men go first to death, even if they know that both must perish, or even if they believe that they could save themselves. In primitive times war was so constant that if any clan had acted so it would have been destroyed.

When we realize the terrors and pain through which our ancestors went in ever creating higher orders of society, of which we are the heirs and beneficiaries, we realize that their lives indeed have something of final moral value. We bow before their bravery and endurance. All desire merely to condemn them for their cruelty and passions and to laugh at their ignorance, passes from our souls. We realize how trivial are many of the disappointments and pains of our lives. Someone has justly said that when the eternal God himself looks down from heaven and considers what men have endured in the process of evolution, he must deeply *respect* them. And we, when we think of the ages past, stand as in a cemetery with tombs reaching back for four millenniums; and as we think of the lives of those who lie about us in the graves and realize our debt to them, surely we must dedicate our lives without a whimper to the making of the world better in our day—whatever the cost—as they did in theirs.

But we must not feel that God called primitive man to a more heroic mode of living than he does us. In primitive times when a man fell ill, because no way was known to protect him, he died. The rigorous conditions of survival prevented the survival of a sick man. To-day we have become marvelously efficient in keeping people alive, but alive to suffer. Those afflicted, for instance, with tuberculosis or with angina pectoris suffer more excruciating pain than did the ancient warrior left on the field of battle with a mortal wound and with no anesthetic to dull his pain. And the higher nervous systems of men and women to-day (the necessary condition of our higher civilization) makes us sensitive to fears and griefs of which the primitive man knew nothing. The more disinterested we are the more we suffer for other people—and such suffering is much harder on the nervous system than suffering for

one's self. (Hurley, teachers, ministers, social workers, etc.) . . . God, I say, calls us to as heroic living as he did the heroes of old. We are baptized with the same baptism as that with which they were baptized. If the manner of our personal living justifies it, at the same time that we acknowledge the men of old as heroes, we may look them straight in the eye and clasp their hands as equals and as brothers.

When we undertake to express in our generation the heroism and endurance of the men of old, we shall find, as did they, that we can do so only as we come into the presence of the final reality and experience, the supreme value, even God, which makes our present toil worth while and guarantees that some day it will be crowned with a holy success. In so far as evolution is true, we are more surely one with the God who was with them and through whom they conquered than they were. Therefore for us belief should be easier than for them and progress should proceed more quickly on its glad way.

II. The first moral lesson of the lives of primitive peoples, then, is courage, and the corresponding theological teaching is that belief in God provides men with courage. A second moral lesson is the necessity of sacrifice by the individual for the group; and corresponding to this is the realization that God voluntarily endures our suffering with us and thus redeems us from it. Even in the most primitive battles individuals were called upon to assume positions of especial danger for the good of the tribe. And because women could not fight quite like men, and because they were the mothers of the race, it was better for the tribe for the men to face danger first. So this they did whenever there was any chance to save both the men and women. Thus perforce they came to value women above their other property—at last, above their own lives. Thus the strong learned to sacrifice for the weak—to the extent that the final good of the community demanded.

And what men knew to be right they conceived God as doing. At their call for help (increasingly by his own will as science became separated from religion) God left the delights of his divine existence, entered the dust and carnage of battle and fought for man.

Surely we who have learned of Jesus do not need to have impressed upon our souls the sublimity of sacrificial living. He made it the rule of his conduct, the very source of his experience of blessedness. He saw in it the essential meaning of life and the revelation of the inmost nature of God. He voluntarily took upon himself in sympathy the sorrows of others, and, as a necessary penalty in an evil world for caring supremely for men, he endured the death on the Cross. Thus he died for men, and as his sacrifice weans us from our sin, he became the Saviour of the world. He considered that such living was his mission in life. In fulfilling it he was identifying himself with God's purpose, and so revealing God to man. Since a child who was filled with the *spirit of God* was born to endure unusual hardship, disappointment and defeat, we can no longer fear that God sends us forth to bear the suffering which holiness costs while he sits in safety high in his heavens. We know that in all of our affliction is he afflicted. He becomes one with us as he

was with Jesus. And further, because Jesus stood the ordeal of his life we know that all who have God's spirit can do so also. And because the revelation of God which Jesus made conquers evil impulses in our human hearts, we need not doubt that some day God will have put all things under his feet and reign in unspeakable glory in the hearts of all mankind.

The sacrificial living which Jesus displayed at the full and saw as the inmost nature of God, primitive man made the first hesitant efforts to display and to dare believe that God displays. Primitive man and Jesus are part of the cosmic process by which God is revealing himself to man and through the moral wonder of the appeal drawing men to himself. We take our high place in the order of the ages as we acknowledge the wonder of the human love displayed through the ages, realize that it is the ultimate principle of life, and therefore is *divine* love, and as we display it in our own lives. "Admire heroes if thou wilt," someone has said, "but *only* admire them, and thou remainest a slave. Act as they did and thou shalt become a hero, too."

III. And finally we must remember that primitive man made his progress not by any special intervention of divine power: only by the action and reaction of the individual and surrounding nature and society. As we have seen at a previous hour, primitive man was right (1) in recognizing that cause and effect do not completely explain experience: that purpose and personality are also needed; (2) in recognizing that human purpose is not sufficient: that there must be a cosmic purpose and person; and (3) that men belong to the supernatural sphere along with God because they can defy immediate impulses. But they were wrong in the crudeness with which they conceived of the relation of the divine person thus acknowledged and the processes of nature and the thoughts of men. Primitive man thought of them as exclusive. At any given moment one or the other must function. But we know that they function in marvelous harmony, neither excluding the other, and therefore that a belief in God does not necessitate a belief in miracles. Since God does not work erratically by miracles we must conclude that at no moment was the struggle of primitive man eased. Yet even so God won. Progress was made. The conditions of living and the still small voice of God in the soul were sufficient. The personal relationship which God assumes to man by which he can be interested in each of our passing interests, yet never become completely submerged in it (just as a sympathetic human friend never completely is) enabled God to maintain his own identity and to judge and refine our interests and thus to draw man in the way of his own choosing. When we realize that God used no unusual means which he no longer employs to bring about his conquests of the past, with what proven and unconquerable faith may we look out upon the conditions amid which we live! Life seems chaotic. But God was master of a more furious chaos. Life is unjust. But by injustice God proves his saints. And so, as the third result of our study of the secular life of primitive Israel we see that in order to bring in the Kingdom of the Eternal God we need only pray:

"I ask no dream, no prophet-ecstasies,
No sudden rending of the veil of clay,
No angel-visitant, no opening skies;
But take the dimness of my soul away."

And such prayer, let us remember, God never fails to answer.

Courage, love, faith, a living God and our continual need of Him—these are the moral and theological heritage of the secular life of primitive Israel. We are now free to turn to a study of their specifically religious beliefs and practices.

GEORGE YEISLEY RUSK.

Roland Park, Md.

THE LORD'S PRAYER

It is usually rendered somewhat as follows:

Our Father who art in heaven. 1. Hallowed be thy name. 2. Thy Kingdom come. 3. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. 4. Give us this day our daily bread. 5. Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us. 6. And lead us not into temptation. 7. But deliver us from evil. For thine is the Kingdom and the power and the glory, forever. Amen.

There are nine parts in all, but only seven petitions. The first part is the invocation, and it is most appropriate. 1. Refers especially to the Father, and reminds us of the third commandment. 2. Refers especially to the Son, and intimates that His Kingdom, which was established on the Day of Pentecost, will ultimately attain world-wide supremacy. Then all nations will enjoy the Millennium, the spiritual reign of our Blessed Lord in the souls of men for about a thousand years. 3. Refers especially to the third Person of the Holy Trinity. We are now in the Gospel Dispensation of the Spirit who regenerates and sanctifies the human heart and who will bring about the universal spread of "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." It will be noticed that these three petitions are distinctly directed to the three Persons of the Godhead.

4. Contains the rare word *ἐπιβίωσις*, which is used only in Matt. 6. 11, and in Luke 11. 3, and which is difficult to translate. Wilson in his *Emphatic Diaglott*, uses the phrase "necessary bread." But according to the margin of the Revised Version, this petition would read: "Give us this day our needful bread." This very suitably voices humanity's supplication for temporal benefits.

5. Has two forms—Saint Matthew (6. 12) mentions "debts" and Saint Luke (11. 4) "sins." But debt is too limited and sin is rather intensive. Does not the word trespasses, being more inclusive—including unconscious as well as conscious violations of divine law, including sins of both omission and commission—does it not seem to be the most suitable word? Further, in the immediate succeeding context (v. 14), the Saviour Himself says "trespasses." Evidently, this Old Testament word well expresses the mind of the Spirit concerning this important doctrine of forgiveness, which is the subject of this petition.

6. Has caused some perplexity. For it is definitely stated in James 1. 13, 14: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man; but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." Therefore, as God does not lead men into temptation, there must be some mistake.

The difficult Greek word here is *elenchymos*, which is related to *eisphero* and has many meanings. Bagster in his Analytical Greek Lexicon, among various renderings given to *phero* (omitting the prefix *eis*), mentions these: "to bear, endure, to uphold, maintain, concern." Willson in his Emphatic Diaglott gives this translation: "Abandon us not to trial." Liddell and Scott, in their edition of 1860, give as third meanings "to introduce, bring forward, prepare." But in their later edition of 1869, they give these meanings, "to bear, endure, suffer pain, or misfortune, hardship." Notice the word "suffer."

Mr. Wesley in his note on this passage says: "When we are tempted, O Thou that helpest our infirmities, suffer us not to enter into temptation." In this devout statement, it appears that Mr. Wesley discerned the mind of the Spirit. Would it not be well then to adopt his rendering of this petition, which we have just seen is in harmony with classical usage? We might, however, change his word "enter" into "fall," since fall is shorter and gives a more familiar phrase. Then this petition will read: "Suffer us not to fall into temptation." This puts into an unobjectionable form this great prayer for divine guidance—divine guidance which is so constantly and absolutely necessary for us erring mortals.

7. Implores divine protection for the faithful followers of the Crucified One. The righteous have always had to contend against "the world, the flesh, and the devil"; and they have always been persecuted. Albert Barnes says that "probably no less than 68,500,000 human beings have been put to death by this one persecuting power," the Papacy. See his *Notes on Revelation*, p. 276. How often the Psalmist cried out for God to deliver him! This is a universal temporal and spiritual necessity.

In these last four petitions, four great human needs are specified. We must have food for our bodies, pardon for our sins, guidance for our lives, and deliverance from evil. These four prayers for brevity, simplicity, and comprehensiveness have never been equaled.

Here follows a threefold ascription of dominion, and power, and glory to the Holy Trinity, making a fine doxology.

But still the final and necessary mediatorial expression of all Christian prayer is wanting. In the Confessions of Faith, Prayer Books and Disciplines of the Church, there is, and necessarily so, constant and final mention of our Divine Mediator as the only Intercessor, through whom we can approach the throne of grace. Let all worshipers bear in mind that God out of Christ "is a consuming fire," and that only through Him that redeemed us is the Almighty the Hearer and the Answerer of prayer.

How then can this omission of a final reference to the Saviour be explained?

Remember that this prayer, which is recorded in the sermon on the mount, was given at the beginning of Christ's ministry, and, consequently, before the disciples really understood the mission of their own Messiah. At that time they had only faint conceptions of the infinite significance of the Advent of the Son of God, and, of course, were quite unprepared to change their well-established form of prayer.

More than that, the Mosaic ritual, with its bloody, typical sacrifices for sin, was still in force, and through that typical blood the prayers of the people were heard in heaven. But now the real *atonement* is about to be made by Christ himself as "the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world," and the disciples, instructed by their Lord and endued with the Holy Spirit, will soon understand that henceforth prayer should be made in the name of the Redeemer of mankind.

Now, at the close of His ministry, just before He makes the great Atonement, in His farewell sermon which is recorded in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of John, Jesus announced to them that henceforth prayers should be offered in His Name. This is made very clear in the following six passages of Scripture: 1. "And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son."—John 14. 13. 2. "If ye shall ask anything in my name, I will do it."—John 14. 14. 3. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain; that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, He may give it you."—John 15. 16. 4. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you."—John 16. 23. 5. "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name; ask and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full."—John 16. 24. Here the Saviour reminds them that they had not anticipated his office as Intercessor. But now in the nature of the case and by divine appointment, Christians must add a mediatorial expression to the old Jewish form of prayer.

6. That this will be done, Christ predicts: "At that day ye shall ask in my name; and I say not unto you that I shall pray the Father for you: For the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God."—John 16. 26, 27. Some people should be reminded that Christless prayers from those that call themselves Christians are an abomination in the sight of Heaven.

Thus on the eve of his Crucifixion, after fully instructing his disciples, the Saviour left it for them to supply the omission of his Name. Sometimes the Almighty just lays down general principles and depends upon his Church, guided by his Spirit, to realize his purpose in the actualities of life. According to this mode of procedure, in a large measure, slavery, intemperance, and polygamy were left for Christians to deal finally with in this Dispensation.

Likewise, it is incumbent upon the church to complete this brief and comprehensive, this beautiful and wonderfully appropriate prayer by adding after the doxology some expression of our faith in and of our sense of dependence upon him who is the only "Mediator of the Covenant"

between God and man. Joyfully obeying His injunction, Christians will thankfully add His Blessed Name to this and all prayers. Therefore, let us most humbly, gratefully and reverently, add some such words as these: Through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

After making this addition and some slight changes, this inspired prayer may be rendered as follows:

Our Father who art in Heaven—
Hallowed be thy Name;
Thy Kingdom come;
Thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven;
Give us this day our needful bread;
Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us;
And suffer us not to fall into temptation;
But deliver us from evil—
For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever:
Through Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

Let the church throughout all ages remember what the Saviour said to doubting Thomas, "I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me."—John 14. 16. Also remember Peter's great announcement, "There is none other Name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."—Acts 4. 6. Therefore, give the Name of our Blessed Lord a permanent place at the end of the Lord's Prayer, and indeed, at the end of every prayer; for Christ the Messiah is our only Mediator. Amen.

ALEXANDER HARDL

Los Angeles, Cal.

FOREIGN OUTLOOK

THE PRESENT MISSIONARY MORALE¹

THE purpose of this article is to present a brief study of present missionary morale. In order that the survey might not be questioned as being the reflection of a personal mood, a letter was addressed to more than a score of representative missionaries of seven different denominations requesting an answer to the following questions:

1. Are the missionaries with whom you are in contact discouraged concerning their work?
2. Do you find disturbing doubt in the minds of many as to the worthwhileness of missionary service under existing conditions?
3. If you have found a weakening of missionary spirit to what do you attribute it?
4. Shall there be any change in the policy of Mission Boards? If so, what?

¹[This article by Bishop Grose was also published in the *Chinese Recorder*, Peking, China.]

The replies are candid and illuminating. While expressing different points of view there is striking unanimity in their appraisal of the essential features of the present missionary situation in China. Guided by these letters and by personal contacts with many missionaries in different sections of the country, the writer aims to interpret the present missionary mood.

It must be borne in mind from the outset that there is not one missionary mind but many. Differences in personal temperament, surroundings, denominational policy and the rapidly changing conditions in China make for wide differences in missionary outlook. However, there is a strong and steady current of missionary thinking which is easy to follow. At the same time there is much confusion and uncertainty of mind concerning the fundamental problems of Christian missions. Formerly the missionary task seemed simple. It was the conversion of pagans to faith in Jesus Christ. Its chief objective was the baptism of converts. The ministry of teaching and healing was important mainly as contributing to the work of evangelizing the people. Now the work of Christianizing a community or nation is exceedingly complex. Schools, hospitals, social and industrial enterprises are closely related to the work of evangelization. The closer contacts of East and West, the interchange of ideas of different nationals and the nationalistic movement of recent years have created a new social and intellectual atmosphere for the Christian worker in mission lands. The changing political conditions in the Orient and the new attitude of Orientals toward Western civilization have multiplied the problems of the Christian missionary. The serious challenge of the Christian faith on account of unseemly international contacts and the spread of a naturalistic philosophy in the schools and universities make the work of Christian evangelism increasingly difficult.

Has anything happened to affect the morale of present-day missionaries? Many things.

First, the disturbed conditions in the country have been a tremendous handicap to all the Christian and philanthropic enterprises. The ravages of war and banditry are incessant. For the past three years there has been a steady growth of the anti-Christian movement. Along with the growing appreciation of Chinese culture there has developed a severe criticism of Western civilization. The rising tide of nationalism has developed in its extreme forms an attitude of disrespect for everything foreign, which has made the work of the missionary more difficult. Under the stress of the popular movement in not a few instances Chinese students have shown seeming ingratitude and disloyalty toward those who had helped them to every opportunity of education and advancement. The mission as a foreign organization has been too slow in becoming a part of the Chinese Christian Church. As the result of raising up trained Chinese leaders, and the reasonable demand of the church for autonomy, administrative positions formerly held by foreigners are being transferred to Chinese. The mental strain incident to the perils of wars, riots and disease, also isolation in the interior, is insidious and continuous. Another fact that has had to be reckoned with in the past few years is the

retrenchment of work on account of falling income from Mission Boards. The heavy reduction in working staff, the uncertainty in tenure of service, the inadequate salaries for modest comfort and for educating children create grave personal problems for the missionary. In treaty ports and commercial centers there has been a constantly widening breach between business and missionary groups. There are many foreign business men in the Orient whose personal standards and business practices make for international good will. On the other hand there are those who look upon the protection of foreign trade as the chief duty of the Chinese government, and who regard the missionary as an unwarranted meddler in international affairs. The missionary in protesting against the economic and political exploitation of the people with whom he labors alienates his own fellow countrymen. In addition to all these things, the loneliness of life in a foreign land among people of another tongue, with a different social point of view, long separations from home and friends, and the constant pull of pagan surroundings enter into the very marrow of missionaries.

Now, in view of the conditions above outlined, it would not be strange if there were confusion in thinking and depression of spirit on the part of many missionaries. One finds more discouragement among the older missionaries than among the younger. It is not easy for a benevolent paternalism to pass in to a true fraternalism. If their long-cherished work is turned over to the control of their less experienced Chinese associates some missionaries seem unwilling to take the risk of mismanagement. And yet this risk must be taken by every new generation as it comes to its own in responsibility. The younger group of missionaries in close personal contact with the Chinese are as a rule in full sympathy with the national aspirations of the Chinese and are earnestly promoting the development of a truly indigenous church. One finds also a small group of young missionaries who have become so enamored of Chinese culture and have so fully identified themselves with the nationalistic movement that they are in danger of losing their identity as Christian missionaries. They are only a Western echo of Chinese sentiment. They have become such ardent advocates of treaty revision and the abolition of extraterritoriality and other popular causes that their passion in preaching Christ and him crucified is burning low. Others have not yet found themselves. They have been disillusioned concerning missionary life. For a time missionary work was dangerously popular. It had a touch of adventure with an open road to leadership. Now the task is seen stripped of all its glamour. Instead of professional preferment, it means patient, self-sacrificing giving of one's best in the training of Chinese leaders until Christ be formed within them. But the instances above cited do not represent the predominant missionary sentiment. Notwithstanding the difficulties of their work, the great body of missionaries in China are not discouraged. They see the task of evangelizing China on the quantitative side, with only two million Christians among four hundred millions, is only begun. They are calling to the Western Church in the language of Livingstone to the London Missionary Society: "Send me anywhere, so long as you send me forward."

Unquestionably the Christian movement in China faces to-day a great crisis. The crisis arises not from the desperateness of the situation but from the magnitude of the opportunity. The future of Christianity in the Orient for a hundred years to come will be determined largely by what Western churches and nations do in the next five years. With the rapid unifying of China in a true nationalism, with the progress of the mass education movement, with the raising up of well trained Christian leaders, with the growing determination of Chinese Christians to build up a self-supporting and self-perpetuating church, and with the more intelligent hearing of the gospel, stimulated by the anti-Christian movement, it is only nine o'clock in the morning for the cause of Christ in China.

But there is need of a new appraisal of missionary work. There is need of a new apologetic for Christian missions. There is need of a clear analysis of the missionary mind and motive. Four things will tremendously strengthen missionary morale.

First, a clearer understanding of the real function of the Christian missionary. The plan of foreign missions no longer contemplates bringing the whole world under the dominion of one vast organization uniform in creed and in sacrament. It is rather the communication to the Oriental world of the spiritual tradition and the abundant life of Christ. Christianizing a nation does not mean denationalizing a people. The Christian missionary recognizes "racial differences of thought and sentiment" and undertakes to penetrate all the relationships of his world, commercial, political, social and educational, by the moral energy and the spiritual ideals of the gospel of Christ. The call of Christ to the modern missionary is to seek and to save the lost—but not alone lost souls of a heathen world. The world itself, its intellectual achievements, its literature and social institutions, its political and commercial interests, must feel the quickening touch and the transforming power of the Christian life. The missionary is a herald of the kingdom of God—a social and spiritual kingdom—which is like leaven hidden in three measures of meal steadily and certainly leavening the whole mass. To undertake to penetrate the entire area of Oriental thought and life by the spiritual power of the Christian life is a vastly more significant task than the mere baptizing of converts from paganism. To master all the interests and vocations of men by the spirit of goodness, to make Jesus' ideals of character and of service the standards of personal and social life, to dominate all the institutions of business and of government by the principles of mutual respect and fair play is the only objective of Christian missions that will stand the test of modern times and answer the call of Jesus. The essence of the missionary enterprise is found in Jesus' parable of the seed. To put the living seed in contact with the soil and air and then trust to the eternal forces of the harvest is the alluring task of the Christian missionary. The resistless vitality of good men constantly invigorated by the Spirit of God is the sure promise of the world-wide triumph of the gospel of Christ. With this interpretation the missionary enterprise is implicit in the very heart of the Gospel. It is the supreme business of the Christian Church. What is his chief objective? It is not to proclaim a for-

mal doctrine for men's salvation. It is not to transplant Western institutions as indispensable to the welfare of the people of the Orient except as they may be adapted by the people themselves to meet their needs. Much less is the task of the missionary to give to the East the veneer of Western civilization. The function of the Christian missionary is to interpret the teachings and spirit of Jesus Christ so vitally that he becomes to men the power of a new life. Not as an overlord, but as a spiritual leader and colleague the missionary is to help build up a real living Church of Christ for the evangelization of the nation. He is to plant the seed of the kingdom of God in certain confidence that the life of the seed and a ready soil will take care of the outcome. He is the herald of a truth which men everywhere need for their salvation and hope. He is the friend of the poor, the champion of the rights of the downtrodden and oppressed, an example of Jesus Christ in self-sacrificing service. He is preeminently a messenger of God and a helper of his fellow men in the things of the spirit.

Second, wherever there is lack of a compelling conviction of a divine vocation there is inevitably a weakening of missionary spirit.

As long as the sense of our commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature is clear and strong there is no discouragement. As soon as the conviction that ours is a spiritual mission on which we are sent by the will of God begins to die out the difficulties of the task begin to loom large. The missionary to-day needs to soak his mind in the Epistles of Paul. The opening salutation of every Epistle save one breathes this compelling conviction: "I am an apostle of the good news of Jesus Christ, not by the will of men, but by the will of God." Men may not appreciate me, but I am sent by the will of God. Persecutions and perils may await me, but I count not my life dear unto myself if I may finish the ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus. The difficulties may multiply but I am ready to preach the gospel in the face of danger and of death. In the presence dally of his divine commission, the missionary rises above discouragement. The divine call to evangelize the world is not obsolete. Our missionary consecration must be brought up to date. This alone will sustain missionary morale.

Third, there is evident in some quarters a weakening of conviction as to the unapproachable uniqueness of the Christian revelation. The apostle Paul's missionary career was born in the inner certainty that to him "was given the gracious task of making known unto the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of the Gospel of Christ." Unless Christianity is to us something more than one of the great religions of the world, missionary passion cannot be sustained. Unless Jesus Christ is something more than one of the world's great teachers and leaders, missionary zeal will burn out. If in all things and among all men he has the preeminence, if he is the best I know of all mankind in ideal and in power for righteous living, if his Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes—that conviction is the very life nerve of Christian missions. In this faith a missionary writes, "I believe the spread of the gospel is the most important thing in the world." The missionary with this conviction will

have all the greater hospitality of mind for the truth of all other religions. The fullest appreciation of the teachings of Mencius and Confucius will only prepare the way for the completer revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Christianity is not the foe of other religions, but their fulfillment. Knowing the failures of organized Christianity, it becomes the Christian disciple to be humble. Knowing the culture of the Chinese, it becomes the Christian evangelist to be teachable. Whenever he speaks for Christianity in contest with other world religions he must do it in meekness of spirit and in assurance of the final triumph of the Christian faith. Other religions in their ethical teachings closely approach the religion of Jesus Christ, evidencing the fact that in no time or place has God left himself without witness among men. But the lack of the great ethnic faiths, the lack for which nothing else can atone, is Christ. They have no Christ, the Saviour and Lord; and without him life lacks its supreme necessity. This unfaltering conviction is the very heart of the missionary enterprise. When this conviction wavers, missionary enthusiasm dies. So long as the Christian missionary believes with all his heart that "In Him was Life, and that Life was the Light of Men. The Light shines in the darkness and the darkness has not overpowered it"—so long will the Christian faith triumph and the church will sing its hymn of hope:

"For the darkness shall turn to dawning
And the dawning to noonday bright:
And Christ's great Kingdom shall come on earth,
The Kingdom of love and light."

Fourth, another important element in present missionary morale is the attitude of Mission Boards and the home church. A larger confidence on the part of the Boards in the ability of the workers on the field to administer the affairs of their work would be tremendously heartening. The lack of flexibility in a system dealing with persons and with human situations at the long range of twelve thousand miles makes for friction and inefficiency. The continued discussion of policy of retrenchment or advance takes the heart out of those who are on the front lines, eager to push forward. Further, if the Mission Boards would transfer nine tenths of the details of administration of mission affairs to the mission fields and would devote the bulk of their energies to spreading abroad in the home church information that is fresh and appealing and to arousing the conscience of the church to take seriously the great enterprise of world evangelism it would make mightily for the strengthening of missionary morale. One missionary who is giving the full measure of devotion writes, not in complaint, but in a ringing appeal for reinforcements: "Tell the Mission Boards to 'buck up' and send more missionaries." In short, what is needed from the home base to put new hope and courage into the missionaries is more vision and less machinery, more spiritual agony for the redemption of men, and less devising of methods and "setting up" programs; more calling the church to a real consecration to Jesus Christ and less reliance upon the mechanics of money raising. The victory of the cause of Christ depends not chiefly but solely upon our faith in God.

If he lives and leads in lives transformed, in minds renewed, in social consciousness awakened, and in all the efforts to build a new world of righteousness, we will not fear to follow. The Light shines in the darkness and the darkness cannot overpower it.

GEORGE R. GROSE.

Peking, China.

OUR BOOKSHELF

The Spiritual Element in History. By ROBERT W. McLAUGHLIN. Pp. 312. Svo. New York and Cincinnati: The Abingdon Press. \$2.50.

Does history have any relation to religion? Much is being said to-day about philosophy, psychology and science in their attitude to religion, but almost nothing as to the spiritual element in history. This book is therefore traveling a newly made road of thought and with highly valuable discoveries.

Doctor McLaughlin marches by many roads to this mountain-top ideal of the spiritual interpretation of history. He says that when "people ask Why? they are philosophers; when they ask How, they are psychologists; when they ask What? they are scientists; and when they ask What? and How? that they may answer Why? they are historians." He asks and answers all these questions himself in the following chapters.

"Why is history?" Most important of all past answers to this inquiry are doubtless those specialized in Chapter I. Three pioneers in this problem are Augustine in his *City of God*, Hegel in *The Philosophy of History*, and Marx in many of his writings. "Augustine said history is from above and spiritual. Hegel said it is from within and intellectual; Marx says it is from below and physical." Though in some real sense they are pioneers, they were not wholly original and none of them fully complete, certainly not Marx in his materialistic conception of history and life and his dogma of economic necessity. Yet all three furnish a bit of worthwhile answers to the Why? and in some respect they do overlap each other in their theories. Augustine puts too much theology into history but does lead on to the vision of the spiritual as the dominating element.

History is human and the answer to How? is person, "by the person, individual or collective, as he is interpreted through his recorded acts." "To do this the person must be found. Until he is found there can be no history." Recorded acts may not be wholly correct or even palpably false, and yet when they disclose men's beliefs about the truth, they become good history. As Pascal says, "The whole succession of human beings through the whole course of the ages must be regarded as a single man, ever living and ever learning." This gives a timeless element to history, for person transcends all space and time.

"What?" the scientific problem of history, deals with events, facts which furnish evidence for the Why? and How? This third chapter leads up to this noble statement: "*The spiritual is the perception of the idea lifted up to the level of the ideal by the power of emotion and applied to*

the things of life." Those three forms of energy emphasized by those three pioneers of the Why?—spirituality, mentality, and the physical—dominate different events in history, but they blend in its greatest facts and absolutely in the whole. This noble chapter filled with scores of historic illustrations reaches a real demonstration of this high truth.

"How do the forms of energy—spiritual, intellectual and physical—operate to create the events of history?" Chapter IV, "The Assumptions," gives three of them, the sequence of events, the harmony of all truth and the traceable progress. These are vividly stated and ably defended, especially that latter assumption so much challenged since the World War by men like Spengler and Dean Inge. Those forms of energy do create the events of history and those three assumptions which confirm it lead to a fourth assumption—God.

We have no space to state the brilliant manner in which this author has answered the difficulties and reached the solution, which is God in history. And it is Jesus Christ who has revealed it in his perfect character and perfect teaching. Some thoughts, such as Providence and immortality, do in a sense lie outside of history but they profoundly affect history. "Yet they are met with in life and so are in history." And "man will prove in history what Christ affirmed about history."

A marvelously original book, beautifully and clearly written, filled with abundant and fitting quotations and illustrations from history, literature, science, and religion—it will be to most of us a fountain of fresh culture, an inspiration to living, and a seed source for fruitage in the sermons of the preacher and the life of the laity.

Franciscan Italy. By HAROLD ELSDALE GOAD. Pp. 284. 8vo. 27 illustrations. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. \$6.

HISTORY and geography are so closely wedded in this book—lovely both in theme and style—that they never can be divorced. "Saint Francis and his period are one picture; he cannot well be understood without them." The beautiful topography of Umbria is a background which does not lessen but increases the portrait of this Poor Man of Assisi, the foreground figure of every scene in the book.

Mr. Goad has achieved another unusual victory in composition: he has approached the thirteenth century with a medieval rather than a modern vision. He does not project the rationalism of the nineteenth century into the historical picture of an age which knew it not. Had Italy then possessed this spiritual blindness, she would have given us no Francis of that age or a Dante of a later generation. Much of the history and biography of the present is worthless because their authors do not try to behold a different era but only an age filled with their own intellectual littleness. The story of this holiest life becomes more vivid as told in the natural outlines and the mental atmosphere of the years in which Saint Francis was born, lived and died.

This really wonderful work has two striking sections. Book I is the story of the wanderings of the holy hero from his spiritual conversion to

his almost divine death, told most thrillingly and perfectly. Book II portrays the marvelous heritage he left to the world and the results that came from it. And both are told not in the thought and language of a cold realism and cruel cynicism, but from the standpoint of a real religious faith and with genuine idealism. After all, no histories and no biographies are sincerely told except by a writer who intensely and enthusiastically feels their character and significance. Here is a wonderful example of this form of literary genius.

Space in this notice can be given to only a few features of this narrative.

The meeting of Francis and Dominic at the Lateran Council is described in charming detail. These two were different in method and yet not wholly varied in spirit. Dominic had been brought up in the schools and planned "to convert the heretics with the power of reason," but Francis, who was less educated, sought "to convert the worldly with the power of love." Yet Dominic did desire to help the poor and Francis did not despise or reject learning. But the method of Francis was surely the stronger. It is more mighty to move souls by example than by argument. To charm is more attractive than to convince. It would be wisdom to-day to follow Francis not by the condemnation of scholarship but by the crucifixion of that intellectual pride which really cancels both moral and mental progress.

That famous prose poem of Saint Francis, sometimes called the "Canticle of the Sun," and more properly, "Praises of the Creatures," is here revealed to be not a romantic idyl concerning birds and animals, but a portrayal of the Four Elements, Earth, Air, Water and Fire, which he describes as endowed with spiritual life, and instruments of God the Maker and Spirit of Nature. This is not like a descriptive physical science but something more inspiring and just as true, the religious explanation of Nature and Life.

Brother Elias, whose generalism succeeded the leadership of Saint Francis, seems to have possessed some practical abilities, but his spiritual defects led to apostasy and his own downfall. This may have been the source of some of the later declines of the Franciscan Order. Greater than he and more worthy of our respect we behold John, of Parma, and Saint Bonaventure. The former, learned, logical, eloquent in speech, angelic in face and influence, prosecuted and exiled by the Pope, will doubtless be regarded by many of us Protestants as a real forerunner of later reform. Perhaps our only criticism on Mr. Goad's treatment of these two friends is that he joins the Romanistic preference to Bonaventure. Yet the chapter concerning these two can be read by both Papists and Protestants as a rich revelation as to these two mystical, learned, and profoundly pious followers of Saint Francis. Another precious chapter is that concerning Jacopone da Todi, "a fantastic figure in a fantastic scene! God's fool, God's poet." His strange career, his startling conversion, his wild and violent love, his scornful charges of many villainies against Pope Boniface VIII, his languishment for five years in a fetid dungeon, his pathetic death and burial—all these are most fully pictured here in

the romance of the most human of all poets of that age. Many other great Franciscans of after generations are described with both art and enthusiasm.

Besides these, it is not impossible to see other arts whose source was the Franciscan feeling—were not Cimabue and Giotto, those pre-Raphaelite artists who painted Francis and his work for all time to behold and admire, inspired as painters by that Minstrel of God?

Paul Sabatier wrote his great *Life of St. Francis of Assisi* after many visits to the Umbrian towns, but Mr. Goad went over this same Franciscan Italy again and again for five and twenty years, mostly on foot. His marvelous book must henceforth be placed beside that of Sabatier by all who would know Saint Francis. (One of the illustrations in this work appears as frontispiece in this issue of the METHODIST REVIEW.)

The Pathway to Reality. By Viscount HALDANE. Pp. 600. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. \$5.

THIS is a new edition of those Gifford Lectures delivered in 1902-04, now published in one volume but with no changes. They were delivered orally and there is therefore in them a freshness of language and a popular form of expression which not only lends charm but makes the mastery of his argument less abstract and far more practicable.

Lord Haldane is not unlike Josiah Royce in his neo-Hegelian attitude. He is an absolute Idealist, probably led in that direction by Lotze. However, although a student under Lotze, he is doubtless more constructive in his methods because of the Hegelian influences. Ultimate Reality is shown to be Mind. Therefore he finds no room for the mechanistic views of thought or life. Without following in this notice his subtle process of reasoning, full credit must be given to the climax of this marching the Pathway of Reality which is the Absolute Mind, the Infinite Self-Consciousness which is the Personal God.

All interested in philosophy and religion will find food in these lectures, rich in illustrations and choice in poetical and other quotations. Many of us may feel that we have found a more practical pathway, but even these speculative guideposts pointed out by Viscount Haldane will help us on the road.

The Life of Gotama Buddha. By E. H. BREWSTER. Pp. 243. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. \$4.

GOTAMA BUDDHA is certainly one of the chief wonder-men of history, and it is highly valuable that at last we have his biography in the consecutive form, compiled exclusively from the Pali Canon, claimed to be arranged by the Patna Council about 250 B. C. It was not a written document but was made from oral memoirs of various dates, and was probably put in writing some two centuries later. Of course these materials are of varied historic accuracy, yet in this well arranged collection of records there is given us perhaps the purest picture of Buddhism at its best.

We have only space for a few disclosures here furnished of certain distinctions between the life and teachings of Jesus and that of his predecessor of half a millennium previous.

Carefully read, it will be seen that there was a difference wide as the universe between the related forms of their birth. Gotama's was only a reborn life, like that claimed for all men in Hinduism. To be sure it was the rebirth of a Bodhisat, a member of "the hosts of the heaven of Delight," who "descended into his mother's womb, mindful and self-possessed." Seven Indian seers are recorded as born in the same way. Jesus was born by the creative act of the Holy Spirit.

The teaching of Dharma, or duty, has indeed a high form of moral excellence, but it has the pessimistic background that life is essentially wretched and that the prime duty is to get rid of it. Ascetic self-renunciation in Buddhism is primarily a path to suppress conscious experience and not, as taught by Jesus, one that will secure an enlarged personality. The same is true as to that form of future life called Nibbana (Nirvana), "Deliverance lives beyond this realm of consciousness. . . . Rebirth is no more; I have lived the highest life; my task is done; and now for me there is no hereafter." It was in this manner that the Buddha attained Parinibbana. How exactly opposite to the words of Christ: "I am come that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly!"

All students of comparative religion should take and read this biography. It will also be one of largest value to ministers and especially missionaries.

The New Man and Divine Society—A Study in Christianity. By RICHARD ROBERTS. Volume I, pp. 217. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$2.

THE author of this book is preacher and pastor of the American Presbyterian Church, Montreal; and the mere mentioning of this fact is enough to quicken one's interest, not only in the book, but in the author himself, for this church has long been considered as one of the great power centers of the religious life in Canada. Doctor Roberts has evidenced great gifts both as a preacher and a writer; and during his ministry the world-famed renown of that great metropolitan pulpit of Montreal has been well sustained. Before going to Montreal he held important pulpits in London and New York. He is the author of the anonymously published volumes *The Papers of John Pererin* and *The Untried Door*, and also that beautiful little book of love, *The Gospel at Corinth*. A contemporary speaks of Doctor Roberts as a "courageous idealist and the type of leader men are proud to follow."

In his introduction to *The New Man and Divine Society*, the author says: "The book is intended to be the first installment of a study which has engaged me for some time; and if circumstances enable me to carry out my design, two more volumes will follow this one, dealing respectively with the revelation of God in Christ and with the Christian experience and ethic." The material in this book formed the basis for the

Southworth Lectures, delivered in the Theological School in Harvard University in the spring of last year (1926). When one has read this book he will be a little impatient for the coming of the remaining two volumes.

The book is divided into four parts: Part I deals with "Man and His Society"; Part II, "The New Man and the New Society"; Part III, "The Great Misadventure"; Part IV, "The Church in the World." These are subdivided into a series of brief chapters. There is at the close of the book a brief bibliography with notes. We do not find any attempt in this volume to follow the methods of scholastic theology. Doctor Roberts is modern.

He begins his book with the belief that the world is biocentric and that the whole evolutionary process, both cosmic and organic, is one; but the origin and end of life are still hidden in mystery. "Religion," he tells us, "originated as a biological function; and, rightly understood, serves the same purpose still. It holds out before life its transcendental end and inspires it to pursue that end. "We find that human nature is never quite satisfied with itself and present achievements but that it is forever trying to rise above itself, and it cannot be doubted that man has moved forward in many ways. In the moral realm, where progress appears to be altogether too slow, there is a very appreciable advance over a century ago. This is true politically, socially and religiously. Slavery is no longer possible as a political system for a progressive nation—the rights of men and women are regarded now as equal. The thought and ideals of Jesus Christ have changed our social order. Think of our great hospitals and charitable institutions, and the care for the sick, the poor and the afflicted. All these things emphasize the evolution theory and, "the new man and the new society." The sense of social compunction has driven virtually all of the churches to proclaim social creeds and programs.

The author declares that the failure of the church to meet the world's present need is to be found in its preaching ministry; but the renewal of the preaching-office is bound up with the renewal of the church itself, and that is in the church's own hands.

LEWIS KEAST.

Ishpeming, Mich.

The People and the Book. Essays on the Old Testament. Edited by ARTHUR S. PEAKE, D.D. New York: Oxford University Press. \$3.50.

OLD TESTAMENT scholarship has made great progress in recent years but its results are known only to a limited company of students. This volume of essays is therefore heartily welcomed because it addresses the larger constituency of Bible readers who need to have an impartial estimate of the real values of the Old Testament as a guide to religious living. It is, moreover, gratifying to have a company of scholars utter their mature convictions of its superb and inestimable worth, not merely as a compendium of moral rules but as a unique record of the continuous revelation of God which found its climax in Jesus Christ.

Doctor Peake has edited this volume with his well known ability. No attempt is made to standardize the conclusions of the essayists. They are permitted the freedom of scholarship. They even contradict each other on such matters as the date of the Exodus, the interpretation of Isaiah 53, the merits of legalism as compared with prophecy. But these differences are not allowed to obscure the substantial accord of all the writers, who regard the Old Testament as the outstanding witness to an uncompromising monotheism. In this great truth are involved the ethical distinction and spiritual adoration which are the constituent elements of a religion that does justly, loves mercy and walks humbly with God.

These essays cover the whole range of Old Testament study. The history of Israel and of contemporary nations, Hebrew and other allied languages, the religious development and the worship and ritual of the entire period are viewed in the light of modern learning. This conspectus of Old Testament scholarship helps the student to check up his own ideas and to arrive at more reliable conclusions concerning the permanent values of the earlier Scriptures.

Some positions of Old Testament are not reassuring, but uncertainties have always abounded in a realm where finality is justly regarded as the supreme heresy. Much yet remains to be verified, but we are thankful for what has been done to unravel the tangled narrative, so that we can trace the thread along a continuous and straight course and appreciate the fullness of the divine message.

Since revelation is a process in history and through experience, a belief in inspiration must be associated with an understanding of historical exegesis. Help in this direction is found in the essays on The Religious Development of Israel, The Methods of Higher Criticism, Religion from Moses to Simon the Maccabee (three), The Contribution of the Old Testament to the Religious Development of Mankind, The Value and Significance of the Old Testament in Relation to the New.

There is no better volume which reviews with generous discrimination the position of the Old Testament. It has convincing authority as the Word of God, from which light and truth still proceed for instruction in righteousness to make the godly proficient in every good work.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

The Gospel in Modern Poetry. By HUGH T. KERR. Pp. 187. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. Price, \$1.50.

To say that literature has a well-nigh inexhaustible homiletical value is to give expression to a truism. The only preacher who would deny this is the brother who, like Whittier's uncle as depicted in *Snowbound*, is "innocent of books." Many a congregation has been illuminated, edified and exalted through the preaching man's use of mighty spiritual truths gleaned from the inspiring pages of flaming-hearted, clear-visioned masters of prose and poetry. But to use literature effectively in the pulpit is not the easiest of arts. Not all who have attempted to utilize this potent homiletical help have met with entire success. For example, the use of

the frothiest specimens of an effervescent fiction as the basis for an essentially non-religious discourse does not militate to the glory of God. Snippets of poetry gathered for display purposes from some encyclopedia of "sublime and beautiful" thoughts are not especially conducive to the production of the highest or deepest spirituality. But failures innumerable cannot minimize the fact that in literature the preacher can find a treasure house of material which will tend to make his message more genuine, vital and dynamic.

In *The Gospel in Modern Poetry*, by Dr. Hugh T. Kerr of the Shady-side Presbyterian Church of Pittsburgh, there are sixteen addresses which are based on the poetry of to-day. The book, as a whole, is an excellent lesson in the effective use of literature in the sermon. The poems around which the discourses are built are of varying value, but the author is to be commended for eschewing all current platitudinous drivel and silly ditties. Every poem represented is real literature and forms the basis for a real sermon. Among the works utilized are Kipling's "Recessional," Markham's "The Man With the Hoe," De La Marr's "The Listeners," Thompson's "The Hound of Heaven," Henley's "Invictus," Thomas Hardy's "The Imprecipient," and Carruth's "Each In His Own Tongue." It is doubtful if De La Marr in writing "The Listeners" had in mind the thought that Doctor Kerr educes from it, but as a rule the literary interpretation in the book is unexceptionable. The discourses were all delivered over the radio. If every radio audience received material of this kind, certain problems in regard to the value of this miracle of our generation would cease to exist.

LEWIS H. CHRISMAN.

West Virginia Wesleyan College.

Eight Ways of Looking at Christianity. By GRANVILLE HICKS. Pp. 141. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, \$1.50.

As literary editor of a current religious journal the author has been afforded a rare opportunity of looking at Christianity from various stand-points. He assures us that scarcely a religious book dealing with modern controversies has been omitted in his reviews during the last two years; incidentally, then, we might expect the author to speak with some authority.

Here, as the title indicates, are eight different ways of looking at Christianity. It is really a dialogue on religious fundamentals, each character of the book advocating the merits of his own belief. The best that may be said for this little book is not that it adds anything new or informing concerning modern religious controversies, but it is a bit irritant and sets one thinking.

The author has done us a fine service in bringing together these many view points in a single volume; for there are few questions that stand more in need of fresh and clear elucidation than those which center around Christianity. Here we have the Catholic, Fundamentalist, Modernist, Unitarian, and both religious and agnostic Scientists. An English instructor and an artist are the characters who lead in these several dis-

cussions. There are thirteen chapters in the book: the first describes the "personæ dramatis," and the second chapter "A Way of Life"; then follow eight chapters describing the different ways of looking at Christianity. One chapter on "The Kingdom of God" and another on "The Future of the Church," with a brief word "by way of conclusion," close the book.

While this book may find a place in the field of religious forensics, it is hardly possible that it will add much to modern thought. There are many who question the good of religious controversy. Some would maintain that it both poisons and perverts the mind; others, again, deem it the only way to a clearer understanding of Christianity. It ought to be possible, however, for Christians to discuss the great matters pertaining to the kingdom of God without having their minds poisoned, or perverted. Here we are reminded of the words of Omar Khayyam:

"And many a knot unravelled by the Road,
But not the Master-knot of Human fate."

No clear understanding of the deep things of God can be acquired without applying the principles of the Kingdom in the methods of discovery.

Ishpeming, Mich.

LEWIS KEAST.

FACTS, FANCIES AND FADS OF PSYCHOLOGY

The Meaning of Psychology. By C. K. OGDEN. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$3.

Outline of Abnormal Psychology. By WILLIAM McDUGALL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$4.

The Doctor Looks at Love and Life. By JOSEPH COLLINS. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$3.

The Great Abnormals. By THOMAS B. HYSLOP. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$3.50.

Psychology and Morals. By J. A. HADFIELD. New York: Robert M. McBride & Company. \$2.

THE interest in psychology began when man first interested himself in the devious workings of the mind, the emotions, the motives, the will and other activities of consciousness. In recent years the word psychology and its derivatives have passed into circulation as a medium of exchange in almost every walk of life. The "psychological climate" and the "psychological moment" refer to strategic and timely situations. An individual shows "poor psychology" who is lacking in judgment and who subordinates expediency to selfish impulsiveness. The psychology of advertising, of business, of preaching, of education, of nationalism, of religion and of every conceivable purpose and practice clearly proves that the term has become one of convenience or conventionality.

And yet there is a science of psychology which covers a wide field of study and application. The general reader who wants to know something about this extensive realm, and who cannot consult a dictionary every time he meets unfamiliar words, will be satisfied with *The Meaning of*

Psychology, by Mr. Ogden. He takes note of the most recent advances, clearly distinguishes between facts and hypotheses, between psychological and physiological processes, holds his judgment in suspense where insufficient data warn against dogmatic conclusions, realizes that new world vistas require different correlations and adjustments. He furthermore realizes that the chief task of psychology is one of demarcation, and he recognizes that consciousness is an affair of many strands, concerning which neither the mechanist, the behaviorist, the psychoanalyst, nor the pragmatist has the last word. Where apparent differences of opinion are actually but differences in formulation, the assertive acrimony in the camps of psychologists advertises the closed mind, of which they should be the least guilty. We also need to deprecate the indiscriminate use of technicalities and the bandying of terms that are understood only by those who coin them, and that not always with consistency. The need for a judicious guide is most urgent, especially when even fundamental issues receive varying and contradictory interpretations. Mr. Ogden is such a welcome guide. The seventeen chapters are written with conciseness, color and comprehensiveness. The book recalls William James, whose use of plain illustrations helped to make his subject intelligible and acceptable. Instead of going into involved details he furnishes sufficient information on such questions as The Mind and the Body, How the Brain Works, The Growth of the Mind in Animals, Mental Growth in Man, Behavior, Emotion and Character, How the Mind Goes Wrong. The book is an excellent summary of the positive contributions made by psychology. It also serves a practical purpose and shows how, instead of dodging awkward situations, we should face them with decision and follow the way of wisdom.

The borderland phenomena of the abnormal have been investigated by many who have not always realized that these manifestations are elusive and notoriously difficult to observe. They belong to different classes and appear in various relations. The best that psychology can do with these exhibitions at the present is a preliminary sorting out. This arduous task is performed with exceptional ability by Professor McDougall in his *Outline of Abnormal Psychology*. He has had the advantage of a medical training enjoyed by few academic psychologists. This fact doubtless explains why psychology has been slow to enter the field of pathology. It has hitherto been occupied by psychoanalysts of the Freudian school, which is a closed coterie, whose terminology is as fantastic as their generalizations are unscientific. Doctor McDougall as a discerning mediator brings together in a consistent scheme the soundest results of contemporary psychology and of the varieties of abnormal psychology. What had heretofore been cultivated in patches is here presented as a whole and a good attempt is made to bridge the gulf between academic psychology and an understanding of the neuropsychoses. He writes as a student of human nature rather than as a clinician, and while acknowledging that there is no finality to his views he combines careful exposition with searching criticism. "The path of progress is that of the cautious and critical but open mind." He who shows intolerance and

arrogance and presumes to be arbitrary betrays his disqualifications as an efficient investigator in a study where the phenomena are bewildering because of their uncertainties and dissimilarities. The section given to Freudism is disproportionately large, but it is justifiable in view of the disarray of much popular thought concerning it. Even where he is severe in his criticism he is uniformly courteous as he tries to gather the few grains of gold out of the mass of Freudian silt. In an excellent summary Doctor McDougall takes issue with almost every contention of Freudian psychoanalysis and repudiates it (480ff.). Nor is he favorably impressed by the "collective unconsciousness" of Jung. Among the subjects considered are hypnosis, dreaming, repression, dissociation, automatisms, fears, compulsions, obsessions, perversions of the sex impulse, delusions, hallucinations. These and kindred subjects, made repellent by second-hand writers, here receive suggestive discussion. The preacher will find this book of the greatest value in a better understanding of human life at its best and at its worst.

Dr. Joseph Collins has written several volumes of literary criticism. His latest book, *The Doctor Looks at Love and Life*, is a frank discussion of some current tendencies in the United States, from the standpoint of an expert alienist. The emotionalism which he decries often colors his own judgments and leads to such hysterical announcements as, "We are planning and fabricating a new Dark Age." His remarks about matrimonial incompatibilities throw light on some phases of our social problem but he exaggerates about our "adult infantilism," which is "responsible for more social maladjustments, more family discord and more intellectual vagrancy than any disease derangement or other disharmony of mind and body." This quotation illustrates his tendency to rhetorical outbursts which prejudice calm and consecutive appraisals. The chapter on "Fundamentalists and Modernists of Psychology" is a severe arraignment of Freudianism, which as a cult originated and developed in Vienna, where there has always been a greater proportion of "non-conformers to the standards of morals and ethics that modern civilization professes to uphold than any city of Europe." This type is also represented in our own country, but they who make a science of obscenity find less favor with us. The fad of behavioristic psychology and its mechanistic externalism receives deserved criticism. This book might be read with advantage before studying Doctor McDougall's more elaborate treatise.

Another alienist, Doctor Hyslop of London, furnishes a miscellaneous collection of anecdotes from history to illustrate his thesis that the human mind has invariably been "combative in reaction to ideas, that is, to adopt the opposite point of view in argument." But he does not sufficiently reckon with the *Zeitgeist* of each period, and he is unfair to the tyrants, despots, visionaries, crusaders, and men of genius mentioned, when he takes them out of their historical environment and treats them as though they belonged to our own age. Normality in one age may be abnormality in another. If Doctor Hyslop had confined his attention to a few cases which were historically reliable and had omitted material of doubtful

historicity his volume on *The Great Abnormals* might have been a valuable contribution toward a knowledge of the marvelous potencies of mankind.

The sanity and caution needed in the discussion of these and sundry questions are well illustrated in *Psychology and Morals*, by Doctor Hadfield. This practicing physician gathered his material from contacts with life in a variety of situations. His sympathetic insight and patient study of particular cases give his shrewd conclusions an importance which cannot fail to help preachers, parents, teachers and others who are concerned in the solution of moral and religious problems. It covers some of the subjects discussed by Doctor McDougall and is easier reading. The fact that this volume now appears in a third edition speaks well for its worth.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

BIOGRAPHY AND MEMOIRS

The Beloved Physician, Sir James MacKenzie. By R. MACNAIR WILSON. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$4.

The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh. Edited by Lady RALEIGH, with a Preface by DAVID NICHOL SMITH. Two volumes. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$7.

My Life and Times. By JEROME K. JEROME. New York: Harper & Brothers. \$4.

Richard Green Moulton. A Memoir. By his nephew, W. FIDDIAN MOULTON. With a Foreword by Sir MICHAEL E. SADLER. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$1.50.

Principal Caird. By CHARLES L. WARR. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Five shillings.

A Son of the Bowery. The Life Story of An East Side American. By CHARLES STELZLE. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$3.50.

Recollections and Reflections. By NEWMAN SMYTH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.

You Can't Win. By JACK BLACK. With a Foreword by ROBERT HERRICK. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.

Echoes and Memories. By BRAMWELL BOOTH. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$2.

THE day of plaster saints has gone but it is a question whether the new day is much of an improvement when heroes and heroines are brought down from their pedestals and regarded as common clay. This swing of the pendulum from extreme eulogy to what is claimed as historical impartiality tends toward a disillusion which leaves us in a state of barrenness without ideals. The recent studies of Washington and Lincoln doubtless portray their humanness as men of like passions with the average run, but they could not have been what they were if not for certain intrinsic qualities which gave them outstanding distinction.

Biographical portraiture becomes a caricature unless the soundings are accurate. The depths of personality, its spacious environment, its

prolific background must all be considered in any adequate estimate of an individual who merits recognition with a biography. Its writer should also observe the law of ethical and artistic proportion so that the likeness will be neither flattering nor unfavorable but exact in revealing the development of character and of conduct. An autobiography is a self-portrait. It is obviously a personal confession, not necessarily by one who wears his heart upon his sleeve, but who has a regard for self-respect and for the judgment of his readers who are neither gullible nor disenchanted. Its author should reveal the poise of confidence which need not be mistaken for conceit. If he has convictions that have grown out of experience, the reminiscences help us to understand many situations which have baffled our own lives. We are also enabled to see how the law of compensation works so that we are instructed and encouraged in the wise conduct of our affairs. Here are some volumes which meet these tests in varying degrees of success.

Sir James Mackenzie was a genius in his patient and persevering ability to investigate the causes of heart disease. Recognition of his discoveries was first acknowledged in Germany and America. The leaders of British medical skill went on the assumption that a general practitioner could not make first-hand investigations. But Sir James proved to be a brilliant exception and professional prejudice was finally broken down by incontrovertible facts. After a successful practice in the provincial town of Burnley, he showed great courage when at the age of fifty-four years he burned his bridges behind him and started a new practice in London. His career is one of the romances of modern medical science. His confidence was more than justified, for the metropolis soon recognized his remarkable abilities. His standpoint was once revealed in the advice he gave to an American doctor, who inquired what line of research he should take up. "I would advise you to go into general practice and stay there for ten years. Because it is only in general practice that a man can learn how to foresee danger to his patient and how to prevent it." Apply this to the preacher and the importance of pastoral work is at once seen. Apart from the light thrown upon the character of one of the noblest servants of humanity, this life has unusual lessons for the pastor who really holds the key to the Christian situation.

"Letters are a part of the social machinery by means of which persons are put in relation with one another. This is the triumph of letter writing, that it keeps a more delicate image alive and presents us with a subtler likeness of the writer than we can find in the more formal achievements of authorship." These two sentences are from Sir Walter Raleigh's posthumous work, *On Writing and Writers*, just published by Longmans, Green & Co. They well describe the character of the two volumes of his *Letters*, edited by Lady Raleigh. This collection makes superfluous a biography of the late Professor of English Literature at Oxford University. Exception might be taken to some of the letters because of their superficial judgment of men and things. But even so they give greater vividness to his characteristic outspokenness and *bonhomie*. His gift of conversation was extraordinary and this gave distinction to

his lectures and his letters. He was preeminent as a teacher of English Literature in the Mohammedan College at Aligarh, India, and in the Universities of Liverpool, Glasgow and Oxford. His literary criticism is to be found in several volumes which are estimated by himself in these letters. He once described literature as "the record of man's adventure on the edge of things." Raleigh was a humanist in the best sense, and these letters introduce us to a genial and gifted soul who knew the art of making and keeping friends.

Jerome K. Jerome belongs to that type of humorist best represented by Charles Dickens. *Three Men In a Boat* brought Jerome fame but not fortune, particularly in America, where pirated editions were published. *The Passing of the Third Floor Back* made a profound impression wherever it was played. A. G. Gardiner in his *Pillars of Society* declares that "It has ceased to be a play and has become a school of thought, a moral cult, a new evangel." These two works alone place Jerome in our debt, but his writings are considerable, and when they are considered no one should forget *The Idler*, which he edited for several years. The experiences of this preacher's son were varied. In *My Life and Times* he dramatizes these experiences and looks at the good and evil in them, and a mellow spirit keeps him from indulging in the sinister attacks often made by those who have been abused, misunderstood and slighted. He once wrote, "The battle of life is a battle not for but against self. It is from the struggle, not the victory, that we gain strength." This is a book by an amiable soul with a sane and courageous outlook on life.

No one who heard Professor Moulton lecture will soon forget his dramatic force, literary culture and expository skill in presenting the superb values of the Bible as literature. He was one of the pioneers in the literary study of the English Bible, and he advocated the claims of this approach to the Bible with the fervor of a missionary evangelist. After doing considerable University Extension work in Great Britain he came to the United States. He became professor of English literature in the University of Chicago in 1892, and for twenty-seven years, by voice and pen, he preached that the sanity of modern culture is to be maintained by granting in education equal play to classical and biblical literature. This volume is by his nephew, the brother of Dr. James Hope Moulton, the notable scholar of New Testament Greek. It is at once a biography and an estimate of the work of a man to whom all students of the Bible are profoundly indebted. It will be read with appreciation.

The pulpit has been the glory of Scotland and John Caird was the greatest preacher of his age. As a thinker he was excelled by his brother, Edward Caird, the Master of Balliol, but even after he became Principal of Glasgow University it was as a preacher that he wielded an influence. There are few young preachers who would leave the crowds attending their ministry in the city and seek the quiet of a country parish to get a stronger grip on the world's thought. This is what Caird did, and his eight years of such protracted work enabled him thereafter to speak with a conviction and sympathy that helped his congregations to realize the eternal in the temporal with profound impressiveness. The biographer's

enthusiasm for his subject leads him to excusable exaggerations of eulogy and his references to the Disruption show an inexcusable reserve. This study of a previous generation and of a prince of the pulpit nevertheless affords timely lessons, especially to young preachers, on the true secret of pulpit power.

A Son of the Bowery is an autobiography of absorbing interest, full of action and achievement, with illuminating sidelights on the social, industrial and religious aspects of American life and institutions. Mr. Stelzle has taken a prominent part in extensive campaigns for workingmen, in arbitrating labor troubles, in promoting welfare movements, in civic and moral reforms, in presenting the claims of Christ and the church to the alienated. He has a great deal to say about the social unrest, prohibition, the federation of labor and other questions. This unusual book is a revelation of conditions which should be known by the church. Mr. Stelzle has had opportunities, granted very few preachers, to become familiar with the workingman's world in America and Europe. The spirit of the book is well expressed in the last two sentences: "The exponents of social service might well take the Cross as an emblem of their philosophy, for it is more nearly typical of what they believe than any other symbol. The deepest meaning of the Cross finds its expression in unselfish devotion to all the needs of men."

Dr. Newman Smyth has written himself so fully in his numerous books that his autobiography is really a review of the course of his thought. It was influenced by his three interests in the pulpit, in pastoral work, and in civic and social reform. His amazing contributions were the spontaneous outgrowth of the pastorate. As a mediator he occupied a leadership in the church at a time when science and philosophy were undermining the faith of many. He also amply demonstrated the importance of a teaching pulpit. His estimates of some of the theological controversies of a former day have a pertinent bearing on our present situation. But the chief value of this volume is the encouragement offered men in the pastorate to engage in constructive tasks.

What do we know of the underworld of crime? This volume of confessions by Black introduces us to this blood-curdling realm. It is a melancholy record of the heinousness of sin. It also bears glowing testimony to friendly and kindly folk who are ready to help those who are down and out. "All I can say with certainty is that kindness begets kindness and cruelty begets cruelty." That is the substance of Black's philosophy of life after having gone through some of its treacherous experiences. Man is surely capable of better things. If he has the will to be good he will make good when encouraged to do so.

These reminiscences of General Bramwell Booth recall the early days of the Salvation Army, when persecution and opposition were the usual experiences of its members. But the quenchless zeal and defiant devotion of William Booth, Mrs. Catherine Booth and their consecrated associates bore abundant fruit in evangelization. The social work of the Army was an inevitable outcome of its evangelistic activities. This world-wide organization continues to be a blessing to mankind. One testimony to the

soundness of its methods is seen in the greater attention given by the churches to practical Christianity. Readers of *The Life of General William Booth*, by Harold Begbie, will turn with interest to these memoirs by the present leader of the Army, who was closely associated with his father in developing the work, and on whom has fallen the mantle of the founder. This graphic recital of the many-sided operations of one of the most energetic movements of modern times also brings upon the scene many contemporary religious and political leaders. The book must not be lightly passed by.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

The Expositor's Year Book. Edited by JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., with the assistance of G. H. BOX, D.D., WILLIAM FULTON, D.D., and T. H. ROBINSON, D.D. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$4.

THE announcement was received with disappointment over a year ago that *The Expositor* would be discontinued. This London monthly had discharged a most useful service to preachers for fifty years. Its place cannot be taken by an annual volume and yet *The Expositor's Year Book* is the sequel to the discontinuance of that magazine. Such a volume has long been needed in English to furnish a survey and summary of the year's work in religious and theological literature. Doctor Moffatt's wide reading exceptionally qualifies him to edit this volume, a large part of which he himself has written.

It is a difficult art to write brief and informing reviews of books that give the reader an intelligent knowledge of their contents and value. It is even more difficult to pass in review a large number of books on any one subject and do justice to them all. A volume which attempts to deal with books and magazine articles on many subjects has to follow the law of proportion. This is the arduous task well performed in this volume. Some sections read more like a publisher's breathless catalogue. It is doubtful whether mere lists of titles have any value for the student who rather needs suggestive guidance. In spite of some hurried writing, which was doubtless unavoidable, the work on the whole is ably done.

The most important publications during 1925, as they relate to the exposition and interpretation of the Bible, are reckoned with in these pages. Among the subjects considered are Inspiration and the Bible, The Old Testament, The New Testament, The History of Religion, Apologetics and the Philosophy of Religion, The Psychology of Religion, Mysticism, Science and Religion, Dogmatic Theology, Worship and the Sacraments, The Church and Church Life, Applied Christianity and Christian Ethics, Devotional and Expository Literature. There are omissions, but that was inevitable.

It is a liberal education to turn over these pages and realize that the subject of religion continues to claim the attention of the best minds. A full index adds to the value of this reference book, which all preachers would do well to consult. A hearty welcome to it carries with it the hope that this annual may continue to perform a large service for many years.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

The English of the Pulpit. By LEWIS H. CHRISMAN. New York: George H. Doran Company, \$1.50.

The English of the Pulpit is a title which must excite the curiosity and interest of the clergyman anxious to improve his spoken style and enhance the effectiveness of the Gospel presentation. Its contents will unquestionably reward his study.

Of all forms of public address the sermon is easily first in importance, having to do with the greatest themes, and probably first in popularity, being heard by the greatest number Sunday after Sunday, year in and year out. The automobile may take many away from the house of God, but it brings just as many to the house of God. If the radio has subtracted from church attendance, it has added to home worship. An invisible and unidentified multitude "listen in" every Sunday morning to preachers whom they never saw and probably never will see. How to put the sermon across is a problem that ought to be the main and ceaseless concern of the modern pulpiteer at whose disposal traditional custom, religious habit and the facilities of invention have placed the physical means of reaching a vast congregation, and move him to tireless effort to perfect himself in the art of winning man to Christ through the skilled use of the spoken word whose range and impact have been so highly potentialized.

Doctor Chrisman's book would be valuable to any speaker who addresses audiences of whatever character, since the underlying elements of all effective speech are identical, but the principles so ably and luminously discussed are here applied specifically to the sermon and designed particularly to help the sermonizer. Clearness, simplicity, and force are analyzed by a master of all three, and illustrated by admirably selected specimens from pulpit orators of acknowledged primacy. *The English of the Pulpit* is practical, concrete, helpful, entirely free from the pedantry which is the usual disfigurement of scholarship. It fills a need, and this is more than can be said of the great bulk of shelf-filler which tumbles from our presses.

LEON C. PRINCE.

Dickinson College.

Famous English Books. By AMY CRUSE. Pp. 284. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. Price, \$2, net.

This book is not written for the student preparing for an examination in English Literature. While it may be valuable to every student we believe it will have a wider reading than that which might be expected in public schools and colleges. This is a book that will appeal to that great body of people who neither have the power nor the wish to become scholars or critics of English Literature.

The author's purpose in writing this volume is to emphasize certain high spots in English literature. In a series of twenty-five chapters she takes up most of the famous books, telling us how they were written. The book carries a series of beautiful photographs of the authors whose writings are discussed. These, together with the many biographical incidents often omitted in the ordinary survey of English literature, add local

color to the book. Aside from this there is much valuable information about the original manuscripts. Our attention is called to this interesting fact in the first chapter, on "Beowulf." "In the Manuscript Room of the British Museum there is a small parchment book of one hundred and forty pages, old and worn and discolored. It has evidently suffered from fire, for its edges are charred and broken, and there are holes in some of the leaves."

The second chapter is on "The Vision of Piers Plowman," and the same interesting method is practically pursued in every chapter of the book. There is a beautiful blending of biography with the discussion of these masterpieces that adds new luster and life to every thought they convey. The twenty-five subjects include *Canterbury Tales*, *Wyclif's Bible*, *Paradise Lost*, down to and including *The Idylls of the King*, by Tennyson. This book should encourage industrious and select reading, for here in *Famous English Books* the best is beautifully presented.

Ishpeming, Mich.

LEWIS KEAST.

The Drifting Home. By ERNEST R. GRAVES. Pp. 217. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. \$1.75.

Back to the Home. By DAVID WILLIAM FERRY. Pp. 142. New York: George H. Doran Company. \$1.50.

"THERE are three kinds of American homes, the good, bad and bewildered." There always have been the first two kinds, but the third sort has increased very much lately and is the new and perilous problem of the present.

With this *Drifting Home* the first volume starts, and proceeds to discuss Social Influence Affecting Home Life, What Can the Family Do? The Home a Human Need, Grinding Down the Middle Class, Home Under the Microscope, Youth Speaks, Parents Who Haven't Grown Up, and The Future of the Home. This book will interest good parents, be disagreeably useful to bad ones, and instructive and helpful to the modern bewildered parent.

Back to the Home also recognizes the responsibility of this Jazz Age for family failures, and while not quite so psychologically pedagogic as the other, does place far more emphasis on religion as the family's best friend and sin as its worst enemy. And it is more sermonic in style. It also deals rather more largely with the problem of juvenile delinquencies.

The home is the primary unit both of church and state. Unless brought back in all its richest value, all civilizations will decay.

BOOKS IN BRIEF

The City of Joy. By ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT (Tuttle Co., Rutland, Vt.). The author of *Steeple Among the Hills*, that portrait of the rural church which appeared in the *METHODIST REVIEW* several years ago, is a poet as well as a preacher. This little volume of verses is fine

in fancy and lovely in lyricism. We have dared to print two of the shortest of these poems elsewhere in this number.

Rules of Life for Boys and Girls. By MARION COLMAN (Revell, \$1.50), Doctor Athearn, Dean of the School of Religious Education in Boston University, in his introduction to this book says: "This is a forerunner of the new type of textbooks upon which religious education will depend increasingly for curriculum material." These are lessons in religion based upon both Old and New Testament passages which were written for actual classes under the author's direction. The volume also includes orders for worship, forms of prayer and sacred songs, all fitted to the junior grades.

Student Relationship. By WALTER G. CLIPPINGER (Nelson and Sons, \$1.50). The president of Otterbein College presents "An Orientation Course for College Freshmen and High School Seniors." It is well fitted for discussion groups in schools and colleges and useful for private reading by students. Rich in bibliography.

One Thousand and One Illustrations for Pulpit and Platform. By AQUILA WEBB (Doran, \$3). Of course the best source of illustrations for sermons and speeches is the orator's own mastery of literature and of life. Those who have not reached that summit will find this an excellent collection of such material. First hand fuel makes better fire than second hand, but the latter is quite useful.

The Speaker's Bible. The Gospel according to Saint Luke. Vol. III. Edited by JAMES HASTINGS (W. P. Blessing and Co., Chicago, \$4). There is no richer expository material anywhere than that collected by Doctor Hastings in his many volumes, and none better than this. Such material has its dangers to the lazy preacher, but if thoroughly digested may become a part of one's own experience both in heart and head.

Through Science to God. By CHARLES H. TYNDALL (Revell, \$2). A pretty good treasury of scientific material for illustrative use in preaching and teaching. It is fairly fresh in scientific discoveries, and while very little attention is given to current controversies, such as that concerning evolution, yet the author seems to find no conflict between nature and grace.

Learning to Live. By MARION O. HAWTHORNE (Abingdon. Pupil's book, 60 cents; Teacher's Manual, \$1). A very useful textbook on Christian ethics for the Juniors, nine to eleven, especially adapted to the Vacation Bible School. Based on the Bible, it has good stories and poems, and better still, a training for the children to state in writing their own moral convictions and purposes in addition to those taught them.

The Indian Outlook. A Study in the Way of Service. By W. E. S. HOLLAND (London: Edinburgh House Press, 2s. 6d.). A thought-provok-

ing book concerning the present situation in India, both as to politics and religion, and also a discussion as to the indigenous Christian Church. It is not only a most interesting and well written treatise on this theme, but its basis is first hand knowledge. It would be an excellent companion to Stanley Jones' wonderful work, *The Christ of the Indian Road*.

Concerning the Inner Life. By EVELYN UNDERHILL (Dutton, \$1). Perhaps in the present generation there has been no more vivid expositor of mysticism, especially in its practical form, than Miss Underhill. This beautiful little book consists of three addresses delivered by her to a group of Anglican clergy of the Liverpool Diocese. The minister of to-day has no greater need than a deeper spiritual experience. He will not successfully face the social program, the administrative tasks, or his many parish mechanics, except as power has come from prayer and meditation. This book emphasizes the inner life of the preacher as the sole source of all outer achievement. There is little better devotional instruction and inspiration to be found anywhere else than in this exquisite book.

Making Good In the Ministry. By A. T. ROBERTSON (Doran, \$1.25). Professor Robertson has a well earned reputation to sustain; and in this book he does not deviate from his habit of maintaining it. "There is something sweeter than success. It is to deserve it." This is the thesis he proves in a delightfully intimate and richly spiritual way, so far as the ministry goes. He centers his studies about the life of John Mark. And for this good reason: "Mark should be an inspiration to the average minister, who has to toil in obscure places and unrecognized by the great majority, and who makes mistakes that dishearten him." Under Professor Robertson's exposition John Mark is just such an inspiration.—J. M. V.

Constantinople—The Challenge of the Centuries. By VICTOR MURDOCK (Revell, \$2). Ornate writing is still extant, as witness this production. Its author, a worthy gentleman, deservedly renowned in newspaperdom, is not just multiplying words because he lacks the facts. His reportorial ability is marked. And he had a lot to report. Furthermore, he does! He gives an amazing number of facts concerning that historic city. Nor does he lack high motives in writing. He is calling all and sundry to consider how direly the civilization represented by Constantinople and its ways stands in need of Jesus Christ.—J. M. V.

Jesus and His Bible. By GEORGE HALLEY GILBERT (Macmillan, \$2). Just how did Jesus regard the Old Testament? What value did he place upon it? This question interests all of us—and in this book it is interestingly dealt with. The author is careful to discriminate between the material out of the Old Testament applied to Jesus, by the gospel writers, and the material out of the Old Testament applied by Jesus to himself. He traces both sorts through the "unique material" in each narrative. He concludes that Matthew was trying to trace "a relation of fulfillment be-

tween the Old Testament and the life of Jesus," while Luke sought to explain his death "theologically." According to him, Jesus found in the Old Testament two principles which were fundamental in his own life and teaching: he found great inequalities in the Old Testament, which called for the exercise of judgment on the part of the reader; and he found his own death and the ultimate triumph of his cause foreshadowed there. Yet "Jesus spoke from the spirit and not by the book." He insists that there is a great gulf fixed between Jesus' use of his Bible and the use of it made by the New Testament writers in reporting Jesus: "Thus we find in these documents . . . a gradually increasing departure from Jesus' use of the Bible." He believes that when this distinction becomes clear "the Bible will come into its own in Christian life as the Old Testament came into its own in the life of Jesus." Few of our readers will find themselves in agreement with all this writer contends; but all of them ought to know the things he is talking about.—J. M. V.

The Friendly Four and Other Stories. By RALPH CONNOR (Doran, \$1.75). This author of that well-known novel, *The Sky Pilot*, is a minister (Dr. Charles W. Gordon), and here tells half a dozen stories which are sermons. He takes New Testament narratives and imaginatively enlarges their environment in order to emphasize their spiritual significance. It contains no mythical personages and is free from all theological trappings. It is really worth while to see Jesus and his surroundings more vividly.

Pulpit Prayer and Paragraphs. By WILLIAM L. STIDGER (Doran, \$1.75). Like most of modern extemporary prayers, these give more emphasis to thanksgiving than upon confession and petition. They are beautifully expressed. Possibly more instructive than the prayers are the pulpit editorials. Even when we question Doctor Stidger's positions on current topics, we and his congregations certainly are urged into fuller consideration of them. Stidger, personally, is more visible in this book than even in his earlier literature.

The Gist of the Bible. By ALVIN E. BELL (Doran, \$1.50). Pious but not profound—the real gist of the Bible is deeper than these brief analyses. To make a real book on this title requires both greater scholarship and more intense spiritual vision.

United Churches. By ELIZABETH R. HOOKER (Doran, \$2.75). The Institute of Social and Religious Research is responsible for this publication, which is an essential aid in the study of church union, which has now reached about 1,000 united Churches in the United States. It deals with federated, undenominational, denominational, united and affiliated churches, both in their religious and financial problems. There are several instructive diagrams. Those of us who think we have not got there yet, can face in this book the more puzzling questions and find some answers which will help us on the road.

The Interpreter's House. By CHARLES NELSON PACE (Abingdon, \$1). Life is the universal journey and we all need to visit the House of the Interpreter as did the traveler in *Pilgrim's Progress*, and so avoid a mere Palace Beautiful, Vanity Fair or Doubting Castle. The church is such a house, a real place for pilgrims on life's journey. And the sermons which follow this first address are noble interpretations of life, culminating in *The Frontiers of Life* and *The Fine Art of Living*. Doctor Pace is a true interpreter.

The Gospel of Opportunity. By CHARLES E. SCHOFIELD (Abingdon, \$1.25). These sermons are Ventures in the Interpretation of the Gospel of Jesus. They are not theological but eminently practical. Life has undreamed possibilities that can be achieved in the teaching and Person of Jesus. Here are some striking titles: *Spiritual Parasites*, *The Expanding Life*, *Second-Hand Faith*, *Called to Be Saints*, *Copybooks*, *The Church in Thy House*. Life is not fatalistic; there is a real opportunity through Christian faith, pointed out in these prophetic messages.

Makers of a New World. By JAY S. STOWELL (Methodist Book Concern, 82 cents). A book of inspiration for young folks of the intermediate grade, based on biographical stories, such as Oberlin, Pestalozzi, John Howard, Louis Pasteur, and others. Perhaps the best of all is the portrait of the one still living, Edward A. Steiner, one who helps us all to View the Human Race. This election course should be used in many Sunday schools. Very valuable pedagogically are its Problems for Discussion, its Things to Do, and its bibliography.

Old Testament History. By G. W. WADE (Dutton, \$2.50). The tenth edition of this standard treatise on this theme has been carefully revised with most important corrections and emendations, and brought up to date in its scholarship. Based entirely upon the Bible, it does not follow those valueless views so long held as a coloring of Scripture and derived solely from Jewish tradition. This more modern, more human and really more religious attitude adds vitality and significance to Hebrew history. Although in accordance with principles of historical criticism, this history recognizes the Theistic theory of the universe and the divine intervention in the affairs of humanity. This single volume must be given a high standard among the many books of this kind.

Jesus and the Problems of Life. By SIDNEY A. WESTON (Pilgrim Press, 40 cents). Doctor Weston, editor of the Congregational Publishing Society, is one of the high specialists in religious education. This is a discussion book for young people's classes, from fifteen to twenty years of age. For well nigh every current problem in human life a solution is found both in the life and the teachings of Jesus. The author first taught these lessons with young people's groups and they are the product of this laboratory experience.

A READING COURSE

Reality. A New Correlation of Science and Religion. By BURNETT HILLMAN STREETER, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

EACH age has its own intellectual climate. It consists of current fundamental assumptions which are the common ground of the distinctive outlooks of the age. These assumptions are the outcome in part of conclusions transmitted by the past, and they influence the philosophy, science and theology of the age which inherits them. A thoughtful view of the present situation suggests that we have gained more than has been lost. On the whole, the Christian view of God and the world rests upon firmer foundations than when Professor James Orr delivered his Kerr Lectures on this subject in 1900.

The misunderstandings which caused troublesome disturbances between science and religion have practically disappeared. The aggressive agnosticism which asserted more than its premises warranted, with a dogmatism that surpassed most theologians, has yielded to the acknowledgment that there are areas beyond the purview of present knowledge. The one-sidedness that regarded Nature as "red in tooth and claw" has been replaced by a view that recognizes Mind and Purpose in the universe, and confesses that Nature is "truly the living garment of God." Materialism has received a severe jolt. The conviction is growing that mechanistic explanations are untenable. The processes of evolution demand the acceptance of an ordered continuity of life without haphazard interventions. It is conceded that the business of religion is with the psychical, that is, the spiritual factors of life, and that the task of science is the study of physical aspects that takes note of mere matter and of the ether. (Cf. *Ether and Reality*, by Sir Oliver Lodge, p. 137ff.)

The religionist and the scientist are thus partners laboring in cooperative harmony, although they ask and answer different questions concerning the universe. The better relationship that now exists is seen in the contributions made by men of science to the richer appreciation of religion. Mention has only to be made of such names as Sir Oliver Lodge, J. Arthur Thomson, James Y. Simpson in Great Britain, and Robert A. Millikan, Henry F. Osborn and Alfred N. Whitehead in America, to realize how the new knowledge is offering reconstructions which verify and establish the profound realities of life.

All this is encouraging to those who seek the Truth in its manifold aspects. They know that such a search is never easy, that the supreme heresy is the heresy of finality, that the truly progressive spirit conserves present gains and cherishes an open mind for what may yet come from the womb of the future. The situation is well summarized by Professor A. N. Whitehead in *Religion in the Making*: "The passage of time is the journey of the world toward the gathering of new ideas into actual fact. This adventure is upward and downward. Whatever ceases to ascend, fails to preserve itself and enters upon its inevitable path of decay. The

universe shows us two aspects: on one side it is physically wasting, on the other side it is spiritually ascending" (p. 159).

The contributions are from both sides. If science has given much to religion, religion has also done much for science. What then are the results of this mutual exchange? The answer is to be given in terms of values but we must first face the difficulty due to different conceptions of values. We must lift the question outside the realm of what tends to become almost exclusively subjective and individual, and consider it in its synthetic aspects. That is to say, we must relate the world of facts to the world of values by interpreting the facts in the light of Goodness, Beauty and Truth. The connotations of these three ideals have varied from time to time, but their essential content is satisfactorily understood when brought to the touchstone of Jesus Christ. He is the complete Incarnation of every virtue and of the highest harmony and represents the reality of eternal values.

We need, then, a spiritual philosophy in accord with the best in science and religion. It should reckon with the entire range of modern thought and experience, and determine the general principles involved in their proper correlations. It should ask and answer the right questions and avoid superfluous issues, however important these may be in other connections. Nothing is gained by evasion nor could the desire for facts and proofs be satisfied by mere assertions.

Doctor Streeter has produced such a spiritual philosophy. It comes nearest to meeting our present needs. His gift of lucid exposition is well known. The essay on "The Historic Christ" in *Foundations* showed a mastery of this vital problem. "God and the World's Pain" in *Concerning Prayer*, and "The Defeat of Pain" in *God and the Struggle for Existence* attempted to establish the Christian belief in the augmentation of value. "Christ the Constructive Revolutionary" in *The Spirit* suggested that religious guides should have "the courage to discard what is obsolete and the insight to create what is new." *The Four Gospels* deals with textual criticism and gives a new setting to the New Testament conception of Jesus Christ. These subjects are reconsidered and re-presented in *Reality*, which is described as "a new correlation of science and religion."

Doctor Streeter at times goes to extremes in his analogical and symbolic modes of reasoning but they have the merit of clarifying our thought more helpfully than metaphysical reasoning. "It is possible to treat dogmas, not as intellectual fetters, but as representations in symbolic form of that which cannot be adequately expressed in philosophic or scientific terms; and such a treatment has the historical justification that, at any rate during the first five centuries, dogmatic decisions were avowedly a refusal to accept definitions of belief in terms of the philosophy of that age" (213). Had the church resolutely maintained this attitude, the troublesome controversies of later centuries might have been obviated. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman, in *Imagination and Religion*, gets at the root of the matter when he declares that "legitimate imagination can, if needs be, rewrite Christian theology upon the basis of its accepted facts and

experiences, and make preaching a joyous inspiration for preachers and hearers alike" (59). This was the method of the world's greatest Teacher, whose parables of plastic beauty have fascinated every generation by their revelations of the sublime truths of religion.

The interest in Doctor Streeter's volume is increased by the autobiographical fragment. He realized that he had been asking the wrong questions, whether Christianity is true, and the like, when he should have inquired whether religion answers the riddle of life. He then discovered that a religion competent to do this must have the quality of vision and power—the vision of truth and the power to overcome. He also learned that science has to do with quantity and religion with quality. Both deal with ultimate reality, but science represents it in the nature of a diagram and religion in the nature of a picture.

Religion is thus allied with Art. Science states definite clear-cut theories but Art suggests so as to elicit appreciative spiritual responses which are qualitative rather than quantitative. Religion, however, goes further than Art and makes one conscious of inner values in their moral and æsthetic aspects. It moreover exercises an imperative constraint, not found in Art or Science, which gives the pressure of moral obligation. This is particularly true of Christianity because its theism emphasizes goodness at the heart of the universe. Christianity may therefore be regarded as a kind of synthesis. "Intellectually, its theistic conception of God comprehends the deism of the Mohammedan and the pantheism of the Hindu; emotionally, it fuses the disciplined restraint of Confucius with the fervor of Indian *bhakti*; ethically, it stands as the climax which unifies developments and tendencies which elsewhere only partially achieve maturity" (48).

The supreme distinction of Christianity is in its frank treatment of the problem of evil. The Hindu doctrine of Karma explained the fact of suffering as punishment for sins committed, but human experience does not sustain it. The Old Testament solution went beyond mere justice, as in the classic utterances of the book of Job and of Isaiah 53. Its insistence that the purpose of the universe is redemptive found unique expression in the Cross of Christ, which gave a new vision of God as entering into the world's pain and breaking the power of the world's sin. Indeed, the truth of vicarious suffering, focussed in the Cross, solves the problem of evil in a way not possible by philosophy. (Cf. *Providence, Divine and Human*, by Griffith Jones, p. 219ff.)

The inconclusiveness of materialism is repeatedly exposed in these pages. Attempts to expel mind and free will from the universe have repeatedly failed because the spiritual factors of experience have been excluded. The range of scientific knowledge cannot in the very nature of the case include direct intuitive knowledge which comes by way of religion. It imparts vital experiences which are constantly expanding; but the flux is marked by regularity and rhythm, proving that life is dynamic and not static and that in the last resort it is to be apprehended only from within (100ff.). Here is seen the difference between one psychologist

whose knowledge is obtained from books and the other psychologist whose sympathetic temperament, fortified by scientific knowledge, gives him imaginative insight into the subtleties of human motive and character. Is this not the difference between the trained pastor who is a practitioner in touch with life and the man who attends solely to the pulpit, and who is like the Scotch minister of whom it was said that he was invisible during six days of the week and incomprehensible on the Lord's Day?

In the final analysis, the knowledge of God rests on an empirical basis. Attempts to individualize him by the use of such names as Jehovah, Allah, Father reflect the religious experience in varying degrees of fullness. A comparison of these names shows that our Lord's view of the living and loving God is the highest and leaves nothing more to be desired. Note how it throws light on the fact of "creative strife" (146ff.). Note also the difference between the struggle for existence, which is a destructive principle of elimination, and the struggle for excellence, which is a constructive principle of salvation (153ff.). The profound significance of strife is understood only when thought of as the expression of Creative Love.

Think of this fact of strife in connection with the creative and redemptive personality of Christ. His Messianic consciousness was a sublimation of the prophetic consciousness raised to the *nth* power. The analysis of Doctor Streeter shows a deeper understanding of the Christ of the Gospels than the sophisticated dramatization of Middleton Murry's *Jesus, Man of Genius*. The word "sinlessness" doubtless gives a negative impression but it has repeatedly conveyed to the church the truth of Christ's positive goodness and of his harmonious energy in fellowship with God. Nor have there been wanting men and women in every age who experienced the power of his salvation and rendered him whole-hearted service.

The enduring dynamic of the creative love of God in defeating evil is suggestively expounded with reference to the ideas of justice and the reign of law. The drift of the argument might be gathered from two sentences. "In the Cross of Christ we catch focussed in one vivid moment the eternal quality of Creative Life. But, precisely because it is *quality* that is here expressed, to restate that expression in terms amenable to formal logic is inevitably to miss something of its meaning" (232). In considering the problems of failure and retrieval, of pain, calamity and suffering, Doctor Streeter points out that Christ is the beacon light upon the cliff, visible however dark the night (262).

The chapter on "Religion and the New Psychology" discusses the relation of the divine activity to human activity. Note what is said of the advantages of psycho-therapy and the weakness of psycho-neurosis, in view of the truth that religion is a phenomenon of health and not of disease (276ff.). This is seen in the fact of conversion, which is "the successful resolution of a state of inner conflict" (278). The best discussion of this definite experience of religion is given in *The Psychology of the*

Methodist Revival, by Sydney G. Dimond, just published by the Oxford University Press. This author explains the genius of Methodism from the standpoint of conversion, reckoning with its emotional, intellectual and ethical factors, as furnishing "ample evidence of the organizing capacity and ability of the Methodist mind" (206).

There is much more in Doctor Streeter's book which calls for careful study. Not the least important is that on prayer in its relation to auto-suggestion and telepathy. Indeed, the whole question of prayer demands urgent re-study in directions suggested by this volume, by Percy Dearmer's *The Church at Prayer*, and by Friedrich Heller's *The Spirit of Worship*, recently published.

After all, the essence of Reality is discovered by the practice of religion and not by speculations about religion. This Christ-haunted age of ours is increasingly understanding that the only God worth believing in is the God of holiness and goodness. He is the living, loving God with whom man's religious nature does have communion through the Christ who revealed him. This is the only satisfactory way of quest that leads to conquest, as man through fellowship with the All-Father has assurance of the sublime and supernal Reality controlling all activities. Thus will the kingdom of God be realized on earth. Its standard is the Cross of Christ; its legend, Follow Me.

Side Reading

Essays Catholic and Critical. By Members of the Anglican Communion. Edited by E. G. SELWYN (Macmillan, \$3.25). A discerning notice of this composite volume by the editor of the *METHODIST REVIEW* appeared in the November issue, p. 982. For our present purpose attention is drawn to two essays. One, by Professor Taylor, on "The Vindication of Religion" treats of the threefold witness to God furnished by physical nature, by the moral life of man and by religious experience. The other, by L. S. Thornton, on "The Christian Conception of God," points out the significance of the revelation of God in terms of the highest human life.

Religion in the Making. By ALFRED N. WHITEHEAD (Macmillan, \$1.50). The originality of thought, the arresting way of putting things, the reserve that exacts close thought from the reader, shown in *Science and the Modern World*, are also seen in this brief but weighty volume of four lectures. "Religion in History" stresses the solitariness of religion and challenges some current ideas. "Religion and Dogma" contrasts Christianity with Buddhism as to the problem of evil and declares that the glory of Christ is in the decisiveness of a supreme ideal. "Body and Spirit" has to do with related values. "Truth and Criticism" argues against a departmental theory of religious thought.

For further information about books in general, address *Reading Course*, care of the *METHODIST REVIEW*, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

OSCAR L. JOSEPH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. SOME REFLECTIONS ON PUBLIC WORSHIP.....	341
JAMES ALBERT BEEBE, D.D., Meadville, Pa.	
II. SYMPOSIUM CONCERNING PUBLIC WORSHIP.....	352
Contributors: KING D. BEACH, D.D., Chicago, Ill.; CARL FOWLER PRICE, New York City; Reverend HUGH D. ATCHISON, Dubuque, Iowa; REGINALD L. MCALL, New York City; Reverend ELBERT M. CONOVER, Philadelphia, Pa.; OSCAR THOMAS OLSON, D.D., Baltimore, Md.; Bishop WILLIAM PATTERSON THIRKIELD, D.D., LL.D., Chattanooga, Tenn.	
III. BROWNING'S "CHRISTMAS EVE".....	379
Professor A. W. CRAWFORD, Ph.D., Winnipeg, Canada.	
IV. JOHN WESLEY AND SCIENCE.....	383
Professor CHARLES W. HARGITT, Ph.D., Syracuse, N. Y.	
V. WESLEY'S USE OF SCIENCE.....	394
The Reverend WILLIAM C. S. PELLOWE, Detroit, Mich.	
VI. JOHN WESLEY (Poem).....	404
Major HARRY WEBB FARRINGTON, New York City.	
VII. THE DOCTRINE OF ORIGINAL SIN IN METHODIST THEOLOGY..	406
The Reverend BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOLME, Detroit, Mich.	
VIII. THE PAULINE CRITERIA OF THE SPIRITUAL.....	418
Professor IRWIN ROSS BEILER, Ph.D., Meadville, Pa.	
IX. UNIVERSAL AND "PROVINCIAL" FIGURES OF SPEECH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	427
Dr. NEIL E. STEVENS, Washington, D. C.	
X. BEHAVIORISTIC PROPAGANDA.....	436
Professor KARL R. STOLTZ, Chicago, Ill.	
EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS:	
NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.....	444
Bimonthly Brevities, 444; The Sermon as a Sacrament, 452; The Lord of Life, 455.	
THE HOUSE OF THE INTERPRETER.....	467
The Incoming and Outflowing Spirit, 467; The Third Word of the Cross, 469.	
THE ARENA.....	470
Has He the Holy Grail? 470; The Witness of the Spirit, 471; A Matchless Picture of an Ideal Minister, 472; The Posters on Chinese Walls, 474.	
BIBLICAL RESEARCH.....	476
Public Worship in the Bible, 476.	
FOREIGN OUTLOOK.....	478
Christ in the Mexican Congress, 478.	
OUR BOOKSHELF.....	480
Heiler's <i>The Spirit of Worship</i> , 480; Knox's <i>Knowing the Bible</i> , 481; Pearce's <i>The Scriptures in the Making</i> , 481; Tillett's <i>Providence, Prayer and Power</i> , 482; Fundamentalism and Modernism (three books), 483; Workman's <i>John Wyclif</i> , 485; Hickman's <i>Introduction to the Psychology of Religion</i> , 487; Martin's <i>Psychology</i> , 489; Reuter's <i>The American Race Problem</i> , 492; König's <i>Das Buch Jesaja</i> , 493; Gorman's <i>A Victorian American</i> , 494; Hardie's <i>Study of the Book of Revelation</i> , 495; Barny's <i>The History of the Arabian Mission</i> , 496; Speer's <i>The Church and Missions</i> , 497; Books in Brief, 498.	
THE READING COURSE.....	501
<i>The Psychology of the Methodist Revival. An Empirical and Descriptive Study.</i> By Sydney G. Dimond, M.A.	

WHO'S WHO IN THE REVIEW

JAMES ALBERT BEEBE, D.D., LL.D., formerly Dean of Boston University School of Theology, is now the president of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. He is author of that valuable book, *The Pastoral Office*. The Who's Who of the other contributors to the "Symposium Concerning Public Worship" will be found at the end of each of their articles.

CHARLES WESLEY HARGITT, Ph.D., Sc.D., Professor of Zoology in Syracuse University, is author of *Outlines of Biology*. . . . The Rev. WILLIAM C. S. PELLOWE is pastor of the East Grand Boulevard Methodist Episcopal Church, Detroit, Mich. . . . The Rev. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOLME is an associate pastor of Dr. Lynn Harold Hough in Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.

Dr. NEIL E. STEVENS, of the Pathologist Bureau, United States Department of Agriculture, some time ago contributed a somewhat similar article to the REVIEW on "Botanical Figures of Speech." . . . IRVING ROSS BEILER, Ph.D., is professor of the English Bible and philosophy of religion in Allegheny College. . . . KARL R. STOLZ, M.A., Ph.D., Dean-Elect of the School of Religious Education of the Hartford Seminary Foundation, is author of *Psychology of Prayer*.

A. W. CRAWFORD, Ph.D., head of the department of English literature in Manitoba College, Winnipeg, Canada, is a specialist on Robert Browning and has previously contributed several articles concerning that great Victorian poet to the METHODIST REVIEW.

Professor EDWARD KÖNIG, of Bonn University, Germany; Dr. OSCAR L. JOSEPH, of Plainfield, N. J., and other contributors have already been introduced to our readers.